A SECOND TRUE

DEFENCE

OF THE MEER

Nonconformists,

AGAINST THE

Untrue ACCUSATIONS, REASONINGS and HISTORY of Dr. *EDWARD STILLINGFLEET*, DEAN of St. *PAULS*, &c.

Clearly proving that it is (not ſin but) duty

1. Not wilfully to commit the many ſins of Conformity.
2. Not Sacrilegiouſly to forſake the Preaching of the Goſpel.
3. Not to ceaſe publick worſhipping of God.
4. To uſe needful Paſtoral helps for ſalvation, though men forbid it, and call it Schiſm.

Written by RICHARD BAXTER, *not to accuſe others, but to defend Gods Truth, and the true way of Peace after near* 20 *years loud Accuſations of the* ſilencing, proſecuting Clergy *and their Sons.*

With ſome Notes on Mr. *Joſeph Glanviles* Zealous and Impartial Proteſtant, and Dr. *L. Moulins* Character.

---

1 Tim 6. 5, 6. *Perverſe diſputings of men of corrupt minds, and deſtitute of the truth; ſuppoſing that gain is godlineſs: from ſuch withdraw thy ſelf. But godlineſs with contentment is great gain.*

LONDON: Printed for *Nevil Simons*, at the Sign of the *Three Golden Cocks* at the *Weſt-end* of St. *Pauls*. 1681.

BRITISH MUSEUM

AN

Hiſtorical Preface.

§. 1. THE matter of fact occaſioning this ſecond Defence, hath been formerly, and is after here opened in part. I need now but briefly tell the Reader, that after the long difference between the *Engliſh* Prelatiſts, and thoſe that deſired Reformation and Diſcipline; the moſt of the *Engliſh* Miniſters who were in poſſeſſion of the Pariſh-Churches from 1646, till 1660, obeyed the Parliament, ſo far as to diſuſe the *Engliſh* Book of Common-Prayer, and Subſcription, and Obedience to the Dioceſan Epiſcopacy; ſome of them being moſt for Church-Government by Synods of Parochial Paſtors, and aſſiſting Elders, and moſt for a Reconciling of the ſeveral divided Parties, thinking ſomewhat in the Epiſcopal, Presbyterian, and Independent Parties to be good, and ſomewhat in each of them unwarrantable.

1. They were ſo far Independent as to hold, that particular Churches aſſociated for Perſonal Communion in faith, worſhip, and holy living, were of Divine Inſtitution (ſuch as true Pariſh-Churches are) and that each of theſe Churches ought to have its proper exerciſe of that Diſcipline which is deſcribed by Chriſt, *Mat.* 18. and by St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 5. and in other Texts of holy Scripture, and was exerciſed in the days of *Ignatius*, and ſo on for many hundred years; ſome part of it ſtill remaining even to the times of Popery. Therefore they held, that the Paſtors of ſuch Churches muſt be ſuch as had power to exerciſe the ſaid Diſcipline. And they held, that Pariſh-Bounds were of great convenience againſt diſorder, though not of Divine Inſtitution; not taking all that dwell in a Pariſh to be *eo nomine*, of the

Church, but ſuch of them as were capable, by continued owning their Baptiſmal Covenant, not nullified by proved Hereſie, or inconſiſtent wickedneſs. And they held, that no unwilling perſon was capable of a ſealed Pardon of ſin, and ſo of Church-Communion, nor yet of the true receiving of the uſe of the Paſtoral office: And therefore that none but *free Conſenters* ſhould have the Sacrament, nor be related to the Paſtor, as his Flock of that Church: but the reſt ſhould be conſtrained to live as Catechumens, or Hearers, as they were capable, in peace and quietneſs (and ſuch as the Magiſtrate found meet to be tolerated in other Churches, who only were uncapable in that).

2. They were ſo far for Presbytery, as to hold, that 1. If men of competent ſufficiency, were made by ordination Elders, *ejuſdem ordinis* with the chief Paſtor, to be his Aſſeſſors and Aſſiſtants, though they ſeldom, or never Preached publickly, but helped him in Catechizing, or private over-ſight, and in judging perſons and caſes; and though in neceſſity they laboured with their hands, it would not be unlike the ancient Government. 2. And they judged, that all Gods work ſhould be done in the greateſt concord, and with the beſt mutual counſel and help that might be; and therefore that Synods are to that end of great uſe: and if they were appointed at ſtated times and places, it would by order, be a furtherance to their ends: But they were not for their aſſuming a proper Regent Power, by Majority of Votes over the *minor* part, or the abſent Paſtors; and thought that when fixedneſs occaſioned that uſurpation, occaſional Synods *pro re natâ*, were better. And 3. They judged, that Presbyters are *ejuſdem ordinis* with Biſhops, and that no Biſhops have a divine right to govern without the Presbyters aſſiſtance, nor to deprive them of any of their power, nor their Churches of true Diſcipline or Worſhip, nor the people of their Rights; much leſs to uſe any forcing power of the ſword on any.

3. They were ſo far for Epiſcopacy, as to hold it lawful, and convenient, that the particular Churches have one that ſhall have a Priority, and in many things a Negative Vote, as the Incumbent

bent in each Pariſh hath among his Curates a ſort of power. And that the Presbyteries and Synods have their Moderators; and if they were fixed *durante vitâ*, and had a Negative Vote in Ordinations, they could conſent; ſobeit they were duly choſen as of old, and had no forcing power by the ſword, but only a Miniſterial, teaching, guiding power. And ſome of them thought it of Divine right, that the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts have Succeſſors in the ordinary parts of their office; and that to have a ſpecial care of many Churches, and their Biſhops and Elders are ſome of that ordinary part.

4. And to the *Eraſtians* alſo they granted, that the King is the Supreme Governour of the Church, by the ſword, or force; and that we muſt obey him, not only when he enforceth the Commands of Chriſt, but in all acts of outward circumſtance and order, left by God to his determination, and not appropriated to the Miniſters office. Theſe were the thoughts then of the far greateſt part of the Miniſters that I had then knowledg of.

§. 2. Before the King returned, many Epiſcopal Doctors and great men, perſwaded theſe Reconcilers, that thus much would be accepted to our common concord, if the King were reſtored: But ſome ſaid, They do but decieve you; there are ſuch men now got into chief credit on that ſide, that will ſilence you all, and ruine you, unleſs you will follow *Grotius*, or be of the *French* Religion, or unite in the Pope, as *Principium unitatis*, and obey him, as the *Weſtern Patriarck*, &c. And when you are all turned out, what men have they to ſupply your places?

§. 3. But when the King came in, and encouraged the Reconcilers with the promiſe of his help, they made the attempt in 1660, and 1661. the Hiſtory of which I need not repeat, ſince that foreſeeing what the ſilencing of ſo many Miniſters, and the afflicting of the people of our mind would unavoidably cauſe, we pleaded, we petitioned the Biſhops to have prevented it, by thoſe neceſſary means which they might have yielded

to,

to, to their own advantage: But it was all in vain.

§. 4. When the Act of Uniformity came out, of about 9000 Miniſters that kept in, and had laid by the Liturgy before, about 7000 Conformed (to the altered Liturgy, before any of them ever ſaw it, ſave a few) by declaring their *Aſſent* and *Conſent* (the Act being known before the Book could be Printed:) and about 2000 were ſilenced by that Act. How they behaved themſelves ſince then, is ſo well known, and I have here, and oft declared; and how the Plague firſt, and the burning of the Churches next, and the Kings Licenſes next, did give them the opportunities and calls which made more publick Preaching ſeem to them a duty, that I ſhall not make recital of it.

§. 5. All this while abundance of invectives were poured out againſt them, by many of the Conforming Clergy, in Preſs and Pulpits; and eſpecially in the ears of great men, to whom we had no acceſs, but ſeemed what ſuch men deſcribed us to be. The new Laws againſt Conventicles, and the *Oxford* Act of Confinement had been added to the firſt: Many were hunted up and down, their Goods and Libraries diſtrained; many were impriſoned; ſome there died: The Informers and Proſecutors grew weary: They ſaw the ſeverity came moſt from the Prelates, and the Parliament, the King being not for ſeverity therein: The Juſtices grew unwilling of Execution; the Preachers reprove them, and call on them to put the Laws in Execution; they are greatly offended at the Kings Licenſes; they continue to accuſe us for Schiſm at leaſt, and ſome of Sedition; though we invaded none of their Temples, nor askt them for any part of their maintenance. And the Parliament and Prelates were ſo ſharp againſt us, that we durſt not tell the world *what we refuſed* in *Conformity*, and *why*, leſt we put them upon more ſeverity; nor indeed *could we do it*, the Preſs was lockt up by ſo great penalties. But while we were forced to ſilence, we were lowdly called to, to ſay *what we ſtuck at*, and *what it was that we would have*. And

after

after 17 years ſuch calls, I ventured to name the things; and hence is the ſtorm of the preſent indignation.

§. 6. I had before proved the wilful deſertion of our Miniſtry, eſpecially when the King Licenſed us, to be odious Sacriledg: To this I am told, of mens power to ſilence ſuch as they think deſerve it: I grant it, if they truly think ſo: ſo may they on juſt cauſe alienate Churches, and Church-lands, and hang Malefactors: but not when no ſuch cauſe is given, nor at their pleaſure.

§. 7. When in the firſt *Plea for Peace* I had ſtated the caſe of our Nonconformity, I intended to bring the Proofs of each particular ſuppoſed ſinful, as I after found occaſion. And meeting with abundance that accuſed us of diſloyal, rebellious Principles, I largly delivered my own, and many others judgment of Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Authority, the power of Princes, and the duty of Subjects; and therein alſo wrote ſome Anſwer to Four Accuſations brought againſt us. 1. That we pretend Grace againſt Morality. 2. That we hold, that things Indifferent became unlawful, if commanded. 3. I largly confuted Biſhop *Morley*'s falſe Accuſation of my Doctrine, of the Magiſtrates power to command things unlawful by accident; and Dr. *Parker*'s Doctrine of Scandal. 4. I confuted them that extend our Nonconformity to things which we refuſe not. All this in the *ſecond Plea for Peace*; which none yet, that I know of, have anſwered.

§. 8. And leſt any ſhould think that we are all for Negatives, I wrote a Treatiſe of the *only Terms of Univerſal Chriſtian concord*, which I value above all the reſt, being aſſured that the Churches will never otherwiſe be healed, than by that impartial, ſure, and eaſie Catholick way, which ſome have reviled, but none ſince, that I know of, confuted. One Learned Biſhop (that had a chief hand in our preſent Impoſitions and ejection)

I de-

I desired to tell me, *which is the way* of Christian concord, if this be not: And he maintaineth, That *the only way is to obey the Colledg of Pastors, who are to govern the Catholick Church through all the world, per Literas formatas.* Where this Colledg, as one governing power do meet, or how they signifie their Majority of Votes, and in what cases, and who must gather the Votes (from *Abassia* to *Moscovie*), and in how long time, and how *they* shall come to all men with certainty; and whether the ejected, silenced, and excommunicated, *&c.* may appeal to them, *&c.* I could not learn.

§. 9. In the same Book I sufficientiy confuted Mr. *H. Dodwell*'s great Book, which denyeth not only the Churches and Ministry, which are not by uninterrupted Episcopal Ordination, but also the ordinary salvation of all such Churches, as having no covenant promise, by valid Sacraments delivered them. He hath pretended some defence in a late Book of Letters: to which, if they can be Printed, I hope to give easily a satisfactory reply.

§. 10. In the same book he Publisheth some old Letters of his to me, for the Diocesan frame of *Government*; *the notice of which beforehand* given me, caused me to Publish a *full Treatise of Diocesan Episcopacy*, containing the Reasons why we cannot swear to it, or approve it, or swear never to endeavour any reforming alteration of the frame here setled, and exercised. And whatever Mr. *Dodwell* pretendeth to the contrary, if this Treatise do not fully answer his Letter, and justifie us in this part of Nonconformity, I am unable to judg of the Cause, but am willing to recieve any better information.

§. 11. And because I find false History, not the least cause of ordinary mistakes, and men cry up Diocesan Prelacy, as the ancient, and chief cure of Schism; I gathered an Abstract of the history of Bishops, and their Councils, that the true matter of fact might not be so commonly mistaken as it is.

§. 12. At

§. 12. At the ſame time came out againſt me, Firſt, a book of Mr. *John Cheyneys*, the miſtakes of which I manifeſted in an Anſwer: And afterward old Letters of Mr. *Hinkleys*, to which I had an old Anſwer, which I caſt by, and now Publiſhed: and another Accuſer, abounding with untruths, called the *Impleader*; and another called *Reflections*, or *Speculum*, &c. And another Book of Mr. *Cheneys*, full of moſt pitiful miſtakes; All which, with Juſtice *Roger L'Eſtrange*'s Dialogue, and ſome others, I anſwered together in a Book called the *Third Defence of the Nonconformiſts*, &c.

§. 13. But the Accuſations of Dean *Stillingfleet* in his Sermon, made the loudeſt noiſe: In the Anſwer to which, I chiefly deſired to have come to ſome underſtanding agreement with him, about the true ſtate of our Caſe and Controverſie; and to that end, craved his anſwer to ſeveral neceſſary queſtions; but was not able to procure it. And now in his large Book, where I hoped to have found an Anſwer to them, I look for it in vain. Yea, though Mr. *Hikeringhill* roughly provoked him but to expound his own Text, and tell us intelligibly, what *the ſame Rule* is, which the Apoſtle would have all walk by, he will not do it; but inſtead of that, with unuſual gentleneſs tells me, he will *not differ about it*, if I do but grant, that it is a *Rule that binds us all to do all that lawfully we can for peace*, which I cheerfully grant; And if it be *not lawful* for peace and concord to forbear ſilencing us, impriſoning us, accuſing us as odious for not wilful ſinning, and urging Magiſtrates to execute the Laws againſt us, and making us ſeem Schiſmaticks for not forbearing to Preach the Goſpel, to which we were vowed and conſecrated by Ordination; I know not lawful from unlawful: I cannot yet get him to tell us, what he would have the many ſcore thouſands do on the Lords Days, that have no room in the Pariſh-Churches; with many ſuch, which our caſe is concerned in.

§. 14. I thought his Book had been an Anſwer to mine, and other mens Prefaces; but I find that I was miſtaken: Indeed he *nameth* five Books written againſt his Accuſation: what he ſaith to Dr. *Owen*, and Mr. *Alſop*, I leave to themſelves to conſider of: The

Countrey Gentlemans Caſe, in ſenſe, was this, *Whether all they that think Pariſh-Communion, under the preſent impoſitions, to be ſin, are bound, till they can change their judgment, to forbear all Church-worſhip, and live like Atheiſts, and ſo be damned?* And who can find any Anſwer to this?

Mr. *Barret*'s Queries out of his Books, he ſaith, next nothing to, but a dark retracting his *Irenicon*: And far be it from me to blame him for growing wiſer. But why took he no notice of his own words, cited in the Epiſtle, out of his late Book againſt Idolatry, threatning us all with no leſs than damnation, if *we prefer not the pureſt Church.*

And as to my *Defence*, his Book is nothing like an Anſwer, unleſs his naming me, and citing out of that, and other Books, a few broken ſcraps, which he thought he could make ſome advantage of, may be called an Anſwer.

§. 15. I confeſs he hath made ſome attempt to tell me *what the National Church of* England *is*; but ſo Independently, as I doubt his party will diſown it with great offence. In ſhort, he holds, that there is no ſuch thing as a Church of *England*, in the uſual Political ſenſe, having any Conſtitutive, Eccleſiaſtical, Supreme Power, Monarchical, or Ariſtocratical, or Democratical, but it's only the many Churches in *England*, aſſociated by the common conſent in Parliament, &c. Remember that he and I are ſo far agreed.

As I was writing this, I ſaw a Book againſt him of a friend, too much for me, and ſomewhat freely handling the Dr. which in this point would help them, by ſaying, that the *Convocation having the Legiſlative Church-Power, may be the Conſtitutive, Regent part*: But he confeſſeth to me, that he ſpake not *what is*, but *what he counts ſhould be, or wiſheth*; for the Dr. himſelf had before told us, that the Convocations of *Canterbury* and *York* are *two*, and not united to make *one National, ſupreme power*; ſo that this proveth *no one political Church of England* at all, but only 2 Provincial Churches in *England*.

§. 16. The Dr. hath ſo judiciouſly and honeſtly pleaded our Cauſe in his defence of A. Biſhop *Laud*, and his Book againſt Idolatry, that I have made his words the firſt Chap. of this Book, which if he candidly ſtand to, I ſee not but our principles are the ſame.

§. 17. His

§.17. His book is made up of 3 parts. I. Untrue Accuſations. II. Untrue Hiſtorical Citations (abundance). III. Fallacious Reaſonings.

Would you have an undeniable Confutation, *ad hominem*, in few words?

I. As to his *Principles*, he ſaith himſelf as aforeſaid, *Of Idolat. p. 7. We are ſure that wilful ignorance*, or *chooſing a worſe Church before a better, is a damnable ſin.*

II. As to his Hiſtory of the old *Nonconformiſts*, read A. Biſhop *Bancrofts* dangerous Poſitions, and *Heylins* Hiſtory of Presbytery, charging them odiouſly with the clean contrary, and the Canons made againſt them on that ſuppoſition.

III. As to his Hiſtory, and Doctrine againſt the Election of Bps, which I pleaded; (as I have fully proved his abuſe of Hiſtory in it,) I repeat Mr. *Thorndikes* words, *Forbear. of Penalty. It is to no purpoſe to talk of Reformation of the Churchtoregular Government, without reſtoring the liberty of chooſing Biſhops, and priviledg of enjoying them to the Synods, Clergy and people, in the making of thoſe of whom they conſiſt, and by whom they are to be governed, that I need make no other reaſon of the neglect of Epiſcopacy, than the neglect of it.*

O pray hard to God to provide greater ſtore of skilful, holy and peaceable Labourers for his Harveſt, that by the ſound belief of a better world, have overcome the deluding love of the honours, proſperity and pleaſures of the fleſh, and wholly live to God and Heaven.

POSTSCRIPT.

DR. *Edward Stillingfleet Irenic. P. 114. ſaith*, The Epiſcopal men will hardly find any evidence in Scripture, or in the practice of the Apoſtles, for Churches conſiſting of many fixed Congregations for worſhip, under the charge of one Paſtor; nor in the Primitive Church, for the Ordination of a Biſhop, without the preceding Election of the Clergy, and at leaſt, conſent and approbation of the people; and neither in Scripture nor Antiquity, the leaſt foot-ſtep of the delegation of Church-power; ſo that upon the matter all of them at laſt make uſe of thoſe things in Church-Government, which have no other foundation but the principles of humane prudence, guided by Scripture; and it were well if that were obſerved ſtill.

P. 370. Surely then their Dioceſſes we re not very large, if all the ſeveral Pariſhes could communicate on the ſame day, with what was ſent from the Cathedral Church.

P. 361. I doubt not but to make it appear, that *Philippi* was not the Metropolis of *Macedonia*, and therefore the Biſhops there mentioned could not be the Biſhops of the ſeveral Cities under the juriſdiction of *Philippi*, but muſt be underſtood of the Biſhops reſident in that City.

P. 157. There muſt be a form of Eccleſiaſtical Government over a Nation, as a Church, as well as of Civil Government over it as a Society governed by the ſame Laws.—For every Society muſt have its Government belonging to it, as ſuch a Society: And the ſame reaſon that makes Government neceſſary, in any particular Congregation, will make it neceſſary for all the particular Congregations, joyning together in one viſible Society, as a particular National Church: For the Unity and Peace of that Church ought much more to be lookt after, than of any one Congregation.

P. 131. The Churches power, as to Divine Law, being only directive and declárative; but as confirmed by a Civil Sanction, is juridical and obligatory.

P. 113. Where any Church is guilty of corruptions, both in Doctrine and in practice, which it avoweth, and profeſſeth, and requireth the owning them, as neceſſary conditions of Communion with her; there a Noncommunion with that Church is neceſſary, and a total and poſitive ſeparation is lawful and convenient.

P. 117. Where any Church retaining purity of Doctrine, doth require the owning of, and conforming to any unlawful, or ſuſpected practice; men may lawfully deny Conformity to, and Communion with that Church in ſuch things, without incurring the guilt of Schiſm--*P.* 119. Let men turn and wind themſelves which way they will, by the very ſame argument that any will prove ſeparation from the Church of *Rome* lawful, becauſe ſhe required unlawful things as Conditions of her Communion; it will be proved lawful not to Conform to any ſuſpected, or unlawful practice, *&c.*--They lay the imputation of Schiſm on all them who require ſuch Conditions of Communion, and take it wholly off from thoſe who refuſe to Conform for Conſcience ſake.

A Pre-

A Premiſed explication of the Equivocal word *CHURCH.*

THE word [CHURCH] *being Equivocal, is unfit for our diſputation, till explained: It ſignifieth (being a* Relative) ſeveral *ſorts of related Aſſemblies: which are diſtinct.* I. *In their* Matter: *A Church of* Jews, Turks, Chriſtians, *of Orthodox, and of Heretick, being not one thing.*

II. *In the* Efficient: *A Church of* Gods *inſtituting, or a Church of* mans.

III. *In the* Fnds. 1. *A Chriſtian Aſſembly at a Fair, or Market, or Court, or Army, &c. is not the ſame with an Aſſembly for Religious exerciſes.* 2. *Nor an Aſſembly for* Legiſlation *about Religion (in Parliament), or* Conſultation *in Synods, or* Diſputation *in Schools, the ſame thing as an Aſſembly for ſtated worſhip. &c.*

IV. *In the* Form, *or Conſtitutive Relation to the Correlate: And ſo the great difference which now concerneth us to note is, that a* Church of Equals in Office *and* Power *is one thing, and a* Political Society, *related as* Governours *and* governed, *is another.*

The firſt is either an accidental Aſſembly, *or elſe a* deſigned Aſſemby *by conſent.*

This laſt is either an Aſſembly of Lay-men, *which may be agreed hereafter to come under Government; and may meet to worſhip* God *without a Paſtor; and this in Politicks is uſually called, a* meer Community. 2. *Or an Aſſembly of Rulers or Paſtors in equality (as to Government there.): And this is called, a* Council, Synod, Dyet, Parliament, Convention, *&c.*

V. *A* Governed *or* Political Church *is of Three ſeveral* Species (*at leaſt*) *as there are three* Species *of ſuch Government.*

I. *A* Chriſtian Family, *conſiſting of the* Family-Government, *and* Governed, *living together in holy faith, love, worſhip, and obedience to God; the Maſter being their Teacher, Ruler, and Guide in worſhip.*

II. *A* Paſtoral-Church, *conſiſting of one, or more Paſtors, and Chriſtian people correlated as his flock, for the benefit of his Paſtoral office, which eſſentially containeth a* power to teach them, lead them in worſhip, *and* govern them by the Keys, *as a Miniſterial Judg, who is fit for that Communion. All together is called alſo, the* Power *of the* Keys, *and is ſubordinate to Chriſts* Teaching, Prieſtly, *and* Ruling *Office.*

III. *A* Royal, *or* Magiſtratical Church, *conſiſting of a* Chriſtian Sovereign, *and* Chriſtian Subjects, *to be ruled by his ſword, or forcing power under Chriſt, and his Laws, for the ſpiritual and temporal welfare of the ſociety, and the glorifying, and pleaſing the Lord Redeemer.*

And

And IV. *The* Universal Church *comprehendeth all these three as parts, and is most excellently, properly, and fully called,* the Church, consisting of Jesus Christ *the chief Pastor* (Teacher, Priest, and King, *an eminent perfect* Policy) *with all Christians, as the subject part: It is* visible *in that the subjects, and their profession, and worship are visible; and Christ was visible on earth, is visible in the Court of Heaven, his Laws, and Providence are visible, and he will visibly judg the world, and reign for ever: And it is no further visible. The constitutive, essential parts, are only* Christ *and his* subject-body: *The noblest, organical parts of that body, are Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, Pastors, and Teachers.*

In all this, note 1. *That we have no difference, that I know of, about the Church in any of these senses before mentioned, except,*

1. *How far men may invent Church-forms for Gods service (without Gods particular prescript, or institution).*

2. *Whether it be true, that the King is so* persona mixta, *as some hold, as to be* King *and* Priest, *and to have the power of Church-Keys, and Word, and Sacraments.*

3. *Whether over and above the* loweſt Pastoral Churches *Christ hath instituted a direct, superior Pastoral sort of Churches, to rule the inferior, in* Faith, Worship, *and the* Keys *of Discipline, over Pastors and people? And if so, what are these superior Pastoral Churches, whether Diocesan, Provincial, National, Patriarchal, Papal, or all? And if* Christ *made no such, whether* men *may make them?*

2. *And note, that we are certainly agreed, that the* Magistratical form *of* forcing power, *and the Pastoral form of* Sacerdotal *power of the Keys, are two, though the subjects should be the same (though usually the* Church *is in the Commonwealth, as part): And none of us deny a* Christian Commonwealth, *Monarchical, Aristocratical, or Democratical; and though* this power *be* over the Pastoral Church, *it is but* Accidental, *and not* Essential *to it.*

3. *And note, that the chief questions which I put to the Dr. about this, were,* 1. What is the Pastoral specifying form of the Church of *England? And* 2. *Whether it be of* Divine *or* humane Institution: *And I have brought him to maintain, that* there is no such Church of *England at all. And of the Royal Church or Kingdom we are Members as well as he.*

4. *And Lastly, Note, that as to a* Pastoral Church, *we agree, I suppose, in distinguishing a* Transient, *and a* fixed *relation. And as he that is a Licensed Physician, acteth as such where he cometh, though related fixedly to no Hospital; so if a lawful Minister of Christ, either fixed in another Church, or in none but the Universal, be called,* pro tempore, *for a day, to do his office in another Church, he acteth as Christs Minister, and their Pastor for that day: And if a travelling Christian joyn with them, he is a Member for that day:*

Yea,

Yea, if the whole company intend to meet but that one day in the ſame relations, to the ſame ends, it is a temporary, tranſient Paſtoral Church. But fixed Inhabitants for order and edification, ought to fix their relation and practice.

Though moſt of this be ſaid after, where he calls me to it, I thought meet here to premiſe the Explication of the word [Church] *(as in divers books largely I have done of the word* [Separation] *leſt I imitate him in leaving my explication to the hinder part, and we ſhould diſpute about a word, which the Reader, and perhaps our ſelves underſtand not.*

But we have a greater controverſie than this, riſen ſince A. Biſhop Laud's, *and* Grotius's *Reconciling deſign,* viz. *what the* Catholick viſible Church *is?*

1. *Proteſtants have hitherto held, as the firſt point of difference from the Papiſts, that the* Univerſal Church hath no conſtitutive Head, or ſupreme regent Power but Chriſt. *He hath ſetled no one, Vicarious, or deputed ſupreme, Monarchical, Ariſtocratical, or Democratical.*

2. *Accordingly they noted the difference of two ſorts of Papiſts, ſome that ſet the Pope as ſuperior, above Councils; others (as the Councils of* Conſtance, *and* Baſil, *and the* French, *that make the General Council ſupreme, the Pope being Preſident, as the chief of the Patriarchs, and having many priviledges, as Primate to the Univerſal Church.*

3. *But that in truth, the Catholick governing power of Pope, and the other four Patriarchs, was but a humane form of Church Policy ſetled in one Empire as a National kind of Church, and the Councils were Univerſal as to the Empire, but not to all the* Chriſtian *world (which I have proved againſt* W. Johnſon *fully) called by the Emperour that had no power over other Nations, and ſubſcribed by his ſubjects.*

4. *That the grand cheat that hath ſet up Popery, is the* turning this National Church into an Univerſal Government of all the Chriſtian world; *and pretending that Chriſt, or his Apoſtles ſet up that power over all, which Emperours, and Imperial Councils ſet up only over one Empire.*

5. *We are ſworn againſt Foreign Juriſdiction by the Oath of Supremacy. For the* Roman *Empire is diſſolved, and if it were not, we are no ſubjects of it.*

6. *Yet we hold that all* Chriſtians *ſhould live in all poſſible love and concord, counſelling, and helping one another for the edification of the* Church; *and that ſuch Councils are uſeful thereto, as may be had without more hurt than good. But that no Univerſal governing power beſides* Chriſts (*for Legiſlation, Judgment, or Execution*) *is needful to that concord; nor is a Government of the whole* Chriſtian *world by any* one Political ſupreme, Pope *or* Council, *or* Colledg of Paſtors, *or* Cardinals, *any more poſſible or lawful to be ſought, than that all the Kingdoms on earth have one humane civil Soveraign; though all Kings, as well as all Biſhops, are bound to ſerve God with the greateſt concord that they can attain.*

But

But now he that will read many late Divines of England, *will find, that they are come to this,* 1. *To take the foreſaid* Conciliar, *and* French Papiſts *to be* no Papiſts; *and ſo to make it a controverſie,* de nomine *(in which, for me, let them have their liberty).* 2. *To take it for a neceſſary thing, to believe that the* Univerſal Church in the world hath one ſupreme governing power under Chriſt, *and is a* Society, *that is,* therein viſibly one. *And* 3. *That this* one ruling power *is either a* General Council, *or the* Colledg of all Biſhops on earth. 4. *And that the Imperial Church-form was, and is to be the true Univerſal Church form,* viz. *a* General Council, *where the five Patriarchs are by themſelves, or by conſent.* 5. *And that the Pope is* Preſident, *and* Principium unitatis, *and* chief Patriarch, *and ſo to be obeyed by us.* 6. *And that there is no true way to Univerſal concord but by being of* this one Church, ſo formed, *and* obeying its Univerſal Laws, *which they ſay, Chriſt hath given them power to make.* 7. *And that they are Schiſmaticks, and not to be tolerated that do not ſo conſent and obey.* 8. *Yea, ſay ſome to us in* England, *it is* compelled obedience to all the preſent Impoſitions, *which only muſt cure our diviſions, without abatement for Union, or any Tolerations.*

A great deal more of this nature is built on this principle, that the Church in all the earth is one, as under one humane ſupreme Government, under Chriſt, *and that* all are Schiſmaticks that are not of it, *and* obey it not. *I am not for diſgracing any by the name of Papiſts that refuſe it; whether the* French, *and the councils of* Piſa, Conſtance *and* Baſil *ſhall be called Papiſts I contend not: But whether thoſe falſe principles be the only terms of concord, wiſe men will cautelouſly conſider.*

---

3 0C61

ADVERTISEMENT.

THere is lately Publiſhed a Book of the ſame Authors, called, *A Search for the Engliſh Schiſmatick*, by the Caſe and Characters 1. Of the *Dioceſan Canoneers*. 2. Of the *Preſent Meer Nonconformiſts*. Not as an Accuſation of the former, but a neceſſary Defence of the latter, ſo far as they are wrongfully accuſed and perſecuted by them. And is to be ſold by *Nevill Simmons*, at the Sign of the *Three Golden Cocks* at the *Weſt-end* of St. *Pauls*.

THE

CONTENTS.

AN *Historical Preface: Dr.* Stillingfleet's *judgment as in his* Irenicon.

A Premised explication of the equivocal word Church. What the Catholick Church is in our judgment, and what in the judgment of many of our silencers.——

Chap. 1. *Dr.* Stillingfleet's *large and plain Asserting of our principles in his Defence of Archbishop* Laud, *and* Rom. *Idolatry.* p. 1.

Chap. 2. *Some Animadversions on his Preface: Whether the Jesuits first brought in* Spiritual Prayer. *A full explication of our judgment about* Spiritual Prayer. *His hard terms against mens (high or low) chusing Tutors for their Children.*—— p. 11.

Chap. 3. *Dr.* Stillingfleet *his Accusations examined: His confusion, disputing a question not stated: What he means by* [Our Church] *by* Communion] *by* [Constan.] *by* [Withdrawing] *by* [Separate Congregations] *what* Separation *I am for or against. Whether he say true, that my* Tremendous aggravations of the sin of Conforming were written without the least provocation on their part: or that as designed to represent the Clergy as notorious Lying perjured Villains, p. 22. &c.

Chap. 4. *His false History of the old Nonconformists: as if* Bancroft's Danger. Posit. Heylin, *and all such old accusers, utterly belyed them, and the Canons made against them had a false supposition: his citations examined: More proof of his falsification: The difference between the Nonconformists and the Brownists. How we are used by them. The* Reformatio Legum Eccles. *how much for discipline. I now add my request to the Reader that would know how far the first Reformers were of the Nonconformists mind, and against our new Church-men, that they would but read* Cranmers, *and the other Drs. words cited by Dr.* Stillingfleet *in the end of his* Irenicon *(and left out of Dr.* Burnet's *History) and* Bucer's

cer's Scripta Anglicana, De Regno Dei, *his* Cenſura *of the* Liturgy, & de cura Anim. &c.
The ſtory of Dr. Ames, Paul Bayne, *Dr.* Fulk, &c. *Dr.* Humphrey's *Letter to the Biſhops,*—— p. 55, 56, 57.—

Chap. 5. *The falſe Reaſonings and accuſations of his ſecond part,* p. 59. *My judgment and caſe ſtated, which he falſly reporteth: Others Caſes conſidered Whether it be true,* That there is no other reaſon againſt Communion than was at the firſt Reformation. *Difference proved,* 1. *From the things impoſed.* 2. *From the deſign of the impoſers.* 3. *From the effects.* 4. *From the caſe of the Church with whom we Communicate.* 5. *From the additional reaſons for our Preaching,* p. 64. *What he would have them do that cannot have room in their Churches,* p. 70. *His appeal to my caſe at* Kederminſter, *ſhamed,* p. 71, &c. *His falſe ſuppoſition that moſt of my Hearers need not our Teaching, becauſe they ſometimes hear in the Pariſh-Churches,* p. 73. *He acquits them from Schiſme that ſeparate, if the Church be Schiſmatical,* 74. (*I deſire the Reader then to Read my few Sheets, called* A ſearch *for the* Engliſh Schiſmatick.) *More miſtakes.* p. 74, 75.

Chap. 6. *Whether he be no Chriſtian, that is not a fixed Member of a particular Church? The Doctors Schiſmatical Error Confuted,* p. 76. (*He by this condemneth Apoſtles, and Evangeliſts that were Itinerant and unfixed, ſuch as* Bucer de Regno Dei *would have ſent abroad*) *my exceptions about Churches and Miniſters juſtified, and his Calumny detected,* p 80. *Whether I give too much to the People, or am againſt the Rights of Patrons, or Magiſtrates,* p. 82. *Many more Calumnies to* p. 89. *He accuſeth, me, as accuſing them for naming the ſins that I dare not commit,* p. 89. *More of his vain Accuſations to* p. 92. *Whether he be for ſilencing us* p. 92. *More of his Calumny,* p. 99. *Conſiderable Quere to him,* p. 94. *How he would drive men to Separation,* p. 95, 96. *He is come to Self-condemning Gentleneſs, in expounding his Rule and Text,* Phil. 3. 16. p. 97. *His ſad Enumeration of the cauſes of juſt Separation,* p. 98.

Chap. 7. *He begins his Third Part with more falſe Accuſations,* p. 99. *His Hiſtory for Dioceſan Churches againſt Parochial found fallacious,* p. 100, &c. *His vain Plea for the* Engliſh *Frame,* p. 106, &c. *He ſaith,* Its probable while the Apoſtles lived there were no fixed Biſhops, or but few, p. 108. (*And Dr.* Hammond *ſaith,* No Subject Presbyters) *whether* John Fox *were the Publiſher (or Profacer) of the* Re-

Reformatio Legum, &c. p. 109. *Disciplina hard, but not impossible.* p. 111.

Chap. 8. *What the National Church of* England *is, fully discussed; and the Doctors Self-contradictions detected: He denyeth any true Political Church of* England: *He and we more agreed, than he and other high Church-men, that are for a Constitutive Political Government,* p. 112, 113, &c. *He maketh it an introduction of Popery, to hold that a Church must have a Constutive Regent Church-power; and so fasteneth Popery on the Masters of his cause.*

Chap. 9. *That the mutual Consent of Pastors and flock is necessary to the very being of their Relation.*
About Thirty Proofs from Antiquity, that the Universal Church was for about 1000 *years of that mind, and decreed it,* p. 128, &c.
The necessity of consent proved from the Nature of the work; where the reasons of it are all plainly opened p. 133. &c.
The Doctors contrary surmises and false Histories fully confuted, p. 136, &c.

Chap. 10. *Of the imposed Use of the Cross in Baptisme, and denying Baptisme to the refusers.* p. 153.
His vaine excuses confuted. Whether the Cross be used as a Sacrament. His disingenuous falsifying my words of the use of Crucifixes and other Images, p. 156, &c.
What the Papists ascribe to Sacraments: p. 168.

Chap. 11. *Whether the Excommunicating Church, or the Excommunicate Nonconformists for not Communicating, when* ipso facto *Excommunicate, be guilty of Schisme.* p. 163.

Chap. 12. *Of the* English *sort of* Sponsors, *and the Exclusion of the Parents Duty.* p. 167. *(see more in the Postscript)*

Chap. 13. *Of the three* French *Letters which he subjoyneth.* p. 171.

Chap. 14. *Epistles and Testimonies, Compar'd with the Doctors. And notes on Mr.* Jo. Glanviles *Book, called The* Zealous Impartial Protestant: *With a Letter of his to the Author; and a Digression about Dr.* Lewis du Moulin, *his Published* Picture *and* Death-bed Repentance.

A

The Contents.

A Poſtſcript, of five notices, viz.

1. *Of a new Obſervation of the Trade of taking mony to be Godfathers to Poor mens Children, and miſſing Baptiſme for want of mony.*
2. *A Letter of Mr.* W. Rathbands, *of his Fathers judgment and Practice.*
3. *An Excellent Confutation of Dr.* Stillingfleets *Hiſtory, of the extent of Dioceſes, and Choice of Biſhops, fully proving, that the old Biſhops were Parochial or Congregational, and always choſen by the People, or not made theirs without their free Conſent. By a Learned and faithful Miniſter.*
4. *An Excellent Vindication of the ſilenced Miniſters, by a Conformiſt,* &c.
5. *My Apologie for the Nonformiſts Preaching, Written by me, and Comming out with this.*

ERRATA.

IN the Preface, Sect. 17. line 13. read *pleaded for.* l. 17. after Clergie *and People,* add *of each Diocoſe. So Evident is the right of Synods,* Clergie *and People.*

3 0C61

AN ANSWER TO Dean *STILINGFLEETS*, &c.

CHAP. I.

The Concord of Dr. Stillengfleet *and the Nonconformiſts, eſpecially with the Principles of my* Book of Church Concord, *about the true Nature of Schiſm, and who is the Schiſmatick: written by him at age in his moſt owned books, and not in youth in his Irenicon: I ſtand to all my words againſt Schiſm which he hath cited, and ſo I doubt not but he ſtands to theſe following of his.*

Diſcourſe of Idolatry of Rome, *p.* 7. '[Though we know not what 'allowances God will make for invincible ignorance, we are ſure 'that willful Ignorance or CHOOSING A WORSE 'CHURCH BEFORE A BETTER IS A DAMNABLE 'SIN and unrepented of deſtroys Salvation.

The Papiſts conſent, p. 43. '[I agree ſo far with him, that every Chriſti-'an is bound to chooſe the Communion of the pureſt Church: but which 'that Church is, muſt be ſeen by the grounds it brings to prove the Doct-'rines it teaches to have been delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles. That 'Church is to be judged pureſt that hath the beſt grounds; and conſequently 'it is of neceſſity to Salvation to embrace the Communion of it.

Pag. 194. 195. '[1. The Churches power is only to Edification and 'not to diſtruction: For this was as much as the Apoſtles challenged to 'themſelves; and I hope none dare challenge more: But this is a principle 'of Natural reaſon, that no power in a ſociety ought to be extended

'beyond the benefit of it, or to contradict the end and designe of it. 2. 'The Apostles were the most competent Judges of what made for the Edi-'fication of the Church.]

Pag. 216. 217. '[1. It is agreed on both sides that the Scriptures do 'conteine in them the unquestionable will of that God whom we are 'bound to serve, and it being the end of devotion (as it ought to be of our 'lives) to serve him, what is there, the mind of any one who sincerely de-'sires to do it, can be more inquisitive after or satisfyed in, than the rules 'God himself hath given for his own service. Because it is so easy a mat-'ter for men to mistake in the waies they choose to serve him in: I see the 'world divided more scarce about any thing than this: *Pag.* 218. Can 'any man imagine a better way, if it could be hoped for, than that God him-'self should enterpose, and declare his own mind, according to what way 'they ought to serve him! And this is acknowledged to be done already by 'all Christians in the Scriptures, and after all this must not all persons con-'cerned be allowed to enquire into that which is owned to be the will of God, 'or do they think that ordinary people that understand not Latine and 'Greek ought not to be concerned what becomes of their Souls? If they 'be and do in good earnest desire to know how to please God and serve 'him, what directions will they give him? *They must do as they are bid-'den*] true, say they, if we were to worship you for Gods, we would do 'as you bid us: for we think it fitting to serve God in his own way: But 'we would know whether that God whom we serve, hath given us any 'Rules for his worship or no. How shall we know whether we keep them 'or not, or will you take upon you the guilt of our sins in disobeying his 'will? This seems to be a very just and reasonable request, and I fear it 'will one day fall heavy on those who conceale that which they confess to be 'the will of God, from the knowledge of the people.

Pag. 548. '[I agree with him in the way of proof of a Churches purity, 'viz. by agreement with the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, and that 'the Church is to be judged purest, which shews the greatest Evidence of 'that consent, and that every one is bound to enquire which Church hath 'the strongest motives for it, and to embrace the Communion of it.

Pag. 565. '[14. To suppose the books so written to be imperfect, *i. e.* 'that any thing necessary to be believed or PRACTISED are not con-'teined in them, is either to charge the first Author of them with fraud, 'and not delivering his whole mind, or the writers with insincerity in 'not setting it down, and the whole Christian Church of the first ages 'with folly, in believing the fulness and perfection of the Scriptures in 'order to Salvation.

'Read

Read the reſt of thoſe excellent Rules to the end.

In his excellent, Vindication of Arch Biſhop Laud, *called* A Rational account of the Proteſtants Religion, *he hath the ſame termes of Communion and the ſame deſcription of Schiſm with mine, and I know not how better to expreſs my thoughts, nor plead my Vindication*, viz.

Pag. 289. 'In his defence of Arch Biſhop *Laud* (not yet diſowned) 'ſince ſo great, and conſiderable parts of the Chriſtian Churches have in 'theſe laſt ages been divided in Communion from each other, the great conteſt 'and enquiry hath been which party ſtands guilty of the cauſe of the preſent 'diſtance and ſeparation. For both ſides retain ſtill ſo much of their com-'mon Chriſtianity as to acknowledge that no Religion doth ſo ſtrictly ob-'lige the owners of it to peace and unity as the Chriſtian Religion doth; 'and yet notwithſtanding this, we find theſe breaches ſo far from cloſ-'ing, that, ſuppoſing the ſame grounds to continue, a reconciliation ſeems 'to humane reaſon impoſſible, an Evidence of which is, that thoſe per-'ſons who either out of a generous deſire of ſeeing the wounds of the 'Chriſtian world healed, or out of ſome private intereſt or deſigne, have 'made it their buſineſs to propound terms of reconciliation between the 'divided parties; have been equally rejected by thoſe parties they have 'profeſſed themſelves the members of.

Page. 290. '[The diſtance then being ſo great as it is, it is a very neceſ-'ſary enquiry what the Cauſe of it is, and where the main fault lies: and it 'being acknowledged that there is a poſſibility that corruptions may 'get into a Chriſtian Church, and it being impoſſible to prove that Chriſti-'anity obligeth men to Communicate with a Church in all thoſe corrupti-'ons its communion may be tainted with, it ſeems evident to reaſon that 'the cauſe of the breach muſt lie there, where the corruptions are own-'ed, and impoſed as conditions of communion. For can any one imagine 'it ſhould be a fault in any to keep off from communion, where they are 'ſo far from being obliged to it, that they have an obligation to the con-'trary from the principles of their common Chriſtianity? And where men 'are bound not to communicate, it is impoſſible to prove their not com-'municating to be Schiſm. For there can be no Schiſm; but where there 'is an obligation to communion; Schiſm being nothing elſe but a willful 'violation of the bonds Chriſtian communion. And therefore whenever 'you would prove the Proteſtants guilty of Schiſm, you muſt do it by prov-'ing they were bound to communicate with your Church in thoſe things 'which they are Proteſtants for diſowning of, or that there is ſo abſolute 'and unlimited an obligation to continue in the ſociety of your Church, 'that no conditions can be ſo hard, but we are bound rather to ſubmit

'to them, then not joyn in Communion with you.

'This being a matter of ſo vaſt conſequence in order to the ſetling mens 'minds in the preſent diſputes of the Chriſtian world, before I come to 'particulars, I ſhall lay down thoſe general principles which may mani-'feſt how free Proteſtants are from all imputation of Schiſm. Schiſm 'then importing a violation of that communion which we are obliged to 'the moſt natural way for underſtanding what Schiſm is, is to enquire 'what the foundations are of Chriſtian communion, and how far the bounds 'of it do extend. Now the Foundations of Chriſtian communion in 'general depend upon the acknowledgment of the truth of Chriſtian Re-'ligion. For that Religion which Chriſt came to deliver to the world 'being ſuppoſed true, is the reaſon why any look on themſelves as ob-'liged to profeſs it; which obligation extending to all perſons who have 'the ſame grounds to beleive the truth of it, thence ariſeth the ground of 'ſociety in this profeſſion, which is a common obligation on ſeveral perſons 'joyning together in ſome acts of common concernment to them. The 'truth then of Chriſtian Religion being acknowledged by ſeveral perſons, 'they find in this Religion ſome actions which are to be performed by 'ſeveral perſons in ſociety with each other. From whence ariſeth that 'more immediate obligation to Chriſtian ſociety in all thoſe who profeſs 'themſelves Chriſtians; and the whole number of theſe who own that 'truth of Chriſtian Religion, and are thereby obliged to joyn in ſociety 'with each other, is that which we call the Catholick Church. But al-'though there be ſuch a relation to each other in all Chriſtians as to make 'them one common ſociety, yet for the performance of particular acts of 'communion, there muſt be leſſer ſocieties wherein perſons may joyn to-'gether in the actions belonging to them. But ſtill the obligation to com-'munion in theſe leſſer is the ſame with that which conſtitutes the great 'body of Chriſtians, which is the owning Chriſtianity as the only true Re-'ligion and way to eternal happineſs. And therefore thoſe leſſer ſocieties 'cannot in Juſtice make the *neceſſary conditions of Communion narrower* than 'thoſe which belong to the *Catholick Church*, i. e. thoſe things which de-'clare men Chriſtians ought to capacitate them for communion with 'Chriſtians.

'But here we are to conſider that as to be a Chriſtian ſuppoſeth mens 'owning the Chriſtian Religion to be true, ſo the conveyance of that Reli-'gion being now to us in thoſe books we call the Scriptures, there muſt be 'an acknowledgment of them as the indiſpenſable rule of faith and man-'ners, which is, that theſe books are the great Charter of the Chriſtian 'ſociety according to which it muſt be governed.

'Theſe

'These things being premiſed as the foundation in general of Chriſtian 'ſociety, we ſhall the better underſtand how far the obligation to com-'munion in it doth extend. For which it muſt be conſidered that the 'grounds of continuance in communion muſt be ſuitable and proportion-'able to the firſt reaſon of entring into it. No man being obliged by virtue 'of his being in a ſociety, to agree in any thing that tends to the apparent 'ruin of that ſociety: But he is obliged to the contrary, from the general 'grounds of his firſt admiſſion into it. His primary obligation being to 'preſerve the honour and intereſt of it, and to joyn in acts of it ſo far as 'they tend to it. Now the main end of the Chriſtian ſociety, being the 'promotion of Gods honour, and Salvation of mens Souls, the primary 'obligation of men entring into it, is the advancement of theſe ends to 'joyn in all acts of it ſo far as they tend to theſe ends; but if any thing 'come to be required directly repugnant to theſe ends, thoſe men of 'whom ſuch things are required, are bound not to communicate in thoſe 'leſſer ſocieties where ſuch things are impoſed, but to preſerve their com-'munion with the Catholick ſocietie of Chriſtians.

Pag. 291. 'Setting then aſide the Catholick ſociety of Chriſtians, we 'come to enquire how far men are bound to communicate with any leſs 'ſociety how extenſive ſoever it may pretend it's communion to be. 1. 'There is no ſociety of Chriſtians of any one communion, but may im-'poſe ſome things to be beleived or practiſed which may be repugnant to 'the general Foundation of Chriſtian ſociety.

Pag. 292. '2. There being a poſſibility acknowledged that particular 'Churches may require unreaſonable conditions of communion, the ob-'ligation to communion cannot be abſolute and indiſpenſable; but only 'ſo far as nothing is required deſtructive to the ends of Chriſtian Society: 'Otherwiſe men would be bound to deſtroy that which they beleive, and 'to do the moſt unjuſt and unreaſonable things. But the greater difficulty 'lies in knowing when ſuch things are required, and who muſt be the 'Judge in that caſe, to which I anſwer.

'3. Nothing can be more unreaſonable than that the ſociety impoſing 'ſuch conditions of communion ſhould be judge, whether thoſe conditi-'ons be juſt and equitable or no. If the queſtion were only in matters of 'peace, conveniency, and order, the judgment of the ſociety ought to 'over-rule the judgments of particular perſons; but in ſuch caſes where 'great bodies of Chriſtians judge ſuch things required to be unlawful 'conditions of communion, what Juſtice or reaſon is there that the party ac-'cuſed ſhould sit Judge in her own cauſe?

'4. Where there is ſufficient evidence from Scripture, reaſon and

'tradition that ſuch things, which are impoſed, are unreaſonable conditions 'of Chriſtian Communion, the not communicating with that Society, 'which requires theſe things cannot incur the guilt of Schiſm, which ne-'ceſſarily follows from the precedent grounds, becauſe none can be oblig-'ed to Communion in ſuch caſes, and therefore the not communicating is 'no culpable ſeparation.

Pag. 324. 'His Lordſhip delivers his ſenſe clearly and fully in theſe 'Words; 'Tis too true indeed, that there is a miſerable rent in the Church, 'and I make no queſtion but the beſt men do moſt bemoan it; nor is he 'a Chriſtian, that would not have Unity, might he have it with Truth. 'But, I never ſaid or thought, that the Proteſtants made this rent. The 'Cauſe of the Schiſm is yours; for you thruſt us from you, becauſe we 'call'd for truth. and redreſs of abuſes. For a Schiſm muſt needs be theirs, 'whoſe the cauſe of it is. The *Wo* runs full out of the mouth of Chriſt 'ever againſt him that gives the offence; not againſt him that takes it 'ever.

Page 325. 'I do ſay it now; and moſt true it is, That it was ill done 'of thoſe, who e're they were, who firſt made the Separation. But then '*A. C.* muſt not underſtand me of actual only, but of cauſal Separation. 'For (as I ſaid before) the Schiſm is theirs, whoſe the cauſe of it is: 'and he makes the Separation, that gives the firſt juſt cauſe of it; not he 'that makes an actual Separation upon a juſt Cauſe preceding. And this 'is ſo evident a Truth, that *A. C.* cannot deny it, for he ſays it is moſt true.

That the Reader may clearly underſtand the full State of this Controverſie concerning Schiſm; the upſhot of which, is, that it is agreed between both parties, that all Separation from Communion with a Church doth not involve in it the guilt of Schiſm, but only ſuch a Separation as hath no ſufficient cauſe or ground for it.

Page 131. 'There can be no Separation from the whole Church, but in 'ſuch things wherein the unity of the whole Church lies; for Separation 'is a violation of ſome Union: Now when men ſeparate from the errors 'of all particular Churches, they do not ſeparate from the whole, becauſe 'thoſe things, which one ſeparates from thoſe particular Churches for, are 'not ſuch, as make all them put together to be the whole or Catholick 'Church. This muſt be ſomewhat further explained. There are two 'things conſiderable in all particular Churches; thoſe things which be-'long to it as a Church, and thoſe things which belong to it as a 'particular Church. Thoſe things which belong to it as a Church, 'are the common ligaments or grounds of Union between all parti-'cular Churches, which taken together make up the Catholick Church:

'Thoſe

'Thoſe things which belong to it as a particular Church, are ſuch as 'it may retain the eſſence of a Church without. Now, I ſay, whoſo-'ever ſeparates from any particular Church (much more from all) 'for ſuch things without which that can be no Church, ſeparates from 'the Communion of the Catholick Church: but he that ſeparates only 'from particular Churches, as to ſuch things which concern not their being, 'is onely ſeparated from the Communion of thoſe Churches, and not the 'Catholick. And therefore ſuppoſing that all perticular Churches have 'ſome errors and corruptions in them, though I ſhould ſeparate from 'them all, I do not ſeparate from the Communion of the whole Church, 'unleſs it be for ſomething, without which thoſe could be no Churches. 'An evidence of which, is, that by my declaring the grounds of my ſepa-'ration to be ſuch Errours and corruptions, which are crept into the Com-'munion of ſuch Churches, and impoſed on me in order to it, I withal 'declare my readineſs to joyn with them again, if thoſe errours and cor-'ruptions be left out. And where there is this readineſs of Communion, 'there is no abſolute ſeparation from the Church as ſuch, but only ſuſpen-'ding Communion till ſuch abuſes be reformed: which is therefore more 'properly a ſeparation from the errors, than the Communion of ſuch a 'Church, wherefore if we ſuppoſe, that there is no one viſible Church, 'whoſe Communion is not tainted with ſome corruptions, though if theſe 'corruptions be injoyned as conditions of communion, I cannot commu-'nicate with any of thoſe Churches, yet it followes not that I am ſepara-'ted from the external Communion of the Catholick Church, but that I 'only ſuſpend Communion with thoſe particular Churches, 'till I may ſafe-'ly joyn with them. As, ſuppoſe all the particular men I can converſe 'with, were infected with Leproſie, my not aſſociating with them, doth 'not imply that I am ſeparated from the Communion of all Mankind, but 'that I am loath to be infected as they are, and therefore withdraw my 'ſelf, till I can meet with ſuch healthful perſons with whom I may ſafely 'aſſociate again. And if ſeveral other perſons be of the ſame mind with 'me, and we therefore joyn together, do we therefore divide our ſelves 'from the whole World by only taking care of our own ſafety? And eſpe-'cially if any company of ſuch leprous perſons ſhould reſolve that none 'ſhould live among them, but ſuch as would eat of thoſe meats which 'brought that diſtemper upon them, our withdrawing our ſelves and aſſo-'ciating without them will ſtill appear more reaſonable and commenda-'ble. Therefore we ſay, we do not neceſſarily ſeparate from all Chur-'ches that have errors or corruptions in them, ſuppoſing thoſe errors and 'corruptions be not impoſed on us, as conditions of communion; and

'thence

'thence though we ſhould grant, no one viſible Church free from taint 'or corruption, yet it is not neceſſary we ſhould ſeparate from them all: 'for we may lawfully joyne in communion with Churches having error and corruptions, if our joyning be not an approbation of them. Thus 'though the *Greeks*, *Armenians*, *Albigenſes*, *Abyſſins* may have ſome errors, 'or corruptions, yet if they be not fundamental, and be not joyned as ne-'ceſſary to be approved in order to their communion, notwithſtanding 'them, we may lawfully communicate with them, it doth not then at 'all follow, that if there may be no one viſible Church free from error 'and corruption, it would be neceſſary to ſeparate from the communion of 'the Catholick Church: Becauſe, 1. All thoſe particular Churches may 'not make thoſe errors conditions of communion. 2. Though they did, 'we ſeparate not from them as Catholick, but as corrupt and erroneous 'particular Churches.

Pag. 336. 'To rectifie ſuch groſs miſtakes as theſe are for the future, 'you would do well to underſtand that Schiſm formally taken alwaies im-'ports ſomething criminal in it, and there can be no juſt cauſe for a ſin; 'But beſides that there is that (which if you underſtand it) you would 'call the materiality of it, which is the ſeparation of one part of the 'Church from another. Now this according to the different grounds 'and reaſons of it, becomes lawful or unlawfull, that is, as the reaſons do 'make it neceſſary or unneceſſary, for ſeparation is not lawfull but when 'it is neceſſary; Now this being capable of ſuch a different nature that it 'may be good or evil according to its circumſtances, there can be no abſolute 'judgment paſſed upon it, till all thoſe reaſons and circumſtances be 'duely examined, and if there be no ſufficient grounds, for it then it is for-'mally Schiſm *i. e.* a culpable ſeparation; If there be ſufficient cauſe 'then there may be a ſeparation, but it can be no Schiſm. And becauſe 'the union of the Catholick Church lies in fundamental and neceſſary 'truths, therefore there can be no ſeparation abſolutely from the Catholick 'Church, but what involves in it the formal guilt of Schiſm; it being im-'poſſible any perſon ſhould have juſt cauſe to diſown the Churches com-'munion for any thing whoſe beleif is neceſſary to Salvation. And who-'ſoever doth ſo, thereby makes himſelf no member of the Church, becauſe 'the Church ſubſiſts on the beleif of fundamental truths. But in all ſuch 'caſes wherein a diviſion may be made, and yet the ſeveral perſons divid-'ed retain the eſſentials of a Chriſtian Church, the ſeparation which may 'be among any ſuch muſt be determined according to the cauſes of it. 'For it being poſſible of one ſide that men out of capricious humours and 'fancies renounce the communion of a Church which requires nothing

'but

'But what is juſt and reaſonable: And it being poſſible on the other ſide, 'that, a Church, calling her ſelf Catholick, may ſo far degenerate in Faith 'and Practice, as not only to be guilty of great Errors and corruptions, 'but to impoſe them as conditions of Communion with her, it is neceſ-'ſary, where there is a manifeſt ſeparation, to inquire into the reaſons 'and grounds of it; and to determine the nature of it according to the 'Juſtice of the cauſe, which is pleaded for it.

Page 357. 'The Catholick Church therefore lies open and free, like a 'Common field to all inhabitants. Now if any particular number of 'theſe Inhabitants ſhould agree together to encloſe part of it without con-'ſent of the reſt, and not to admit any others to that right of Common, with-'out conſenting to it, which of theſe two parties, thoſe who deny to yeild 'their conſent; or ſuch, who deny their rights, if they will not, are 'guilty of the violation of the publick and common rights of the place?

Page 358. 'Although nothing ſeparates a Church properly from the 'Catholick, but what is contrary to the being of it; yet a Church may 'ſeparate her ſelf from the Communion of the Catholick by taking upon 'her to make ſuch things the neceſſary conditions of her Communion, 'which never were the conditions of Communion with the Catholick 'Church.

Page 359. 'Since it appears that the Communion of the Catholick 'Church was free for many hundred years without approving or uſing 'theſe things; that Church, which ſhall not only publickly uſe, but enjoyn 'ſuch things upon pain of Excommunication from the Church, doth as 'much as in her lies draw the bounds of *Catholick Communion* within 'her ſelf, and ſo divides her ſelf from the true *Catholick Church*. For 'whatever confines muſt likewiſe divide the *Church*, for by that confine-'ment a ſeparation is made between the part confined and the other, 'which ſeparation muſt be made by the Party ſo limiting *Communion*. 'As it was in the *Caſe* of the Donatiſts, who were therefore charged with 'Schiſme, becauſe they confined the *Catholick Church*, within their own 'bounds: And if any other *Church* doth the ſame which they did, it muſt 'be liable to the ſame charge that they were. The ſum of this diſcourſe 'is, that the being of the *Catholick Church* lies in Eſſentials, that for a 'particular *Church* to diſagree from all other particular *Churches* in ſome 'extrinſical and accidental things is not to ſeparate from the *Catholick* 'Church, ſo as to ceaſe to be a *Church*: But ſtill what ever *Church* makes 'ſuch extrinſical things the neceſſary conditions of *Communion*, ſo as to 'caſt men out of the *Church*, who yeild not to them, is Schiſmatical in ſo 'doing; For it thereby divides it ſelf from the *Catholick Church*: And

'the ſeparation from it is ſo far from being Schiſm, that being caſt out 'of that Church on thoſe terms only, returns them to the Communion of 'the Catholick Church. On which grounds it will appear that yours 'is the Schiſmatical Church and not ours: For although before this im-'poſing humor came into particular Churches, Schiſm was defined by the 'Fathers and others to be a voluntary departure out of the Church, yet 'that cannot in reaſon be underſtood of any particular, but the true Ca-'tholick Church. For not only perſons but Churches may depart from 'the Catholick Church: And in ſuch Caſes not thoſe, who depart from 'the Communion of ſuch Churches, but thoſe Churches, which departed 'from the Catholick are guilty of Schiſm. Theſe things I thought neceſ-'ſary to be further explained, not only to ſhew how falſe that imputati-'on is, of our Churches departing from the true Catholick Church; but 'with what great reaſon we charge your Church with departing from the 'communion of it; and therefore not thoſe whom you thruſt out of Com-'munion, but your Church ſo thruſting them out, is apparently guilty of 'the preſent Schiſm.

Page 366. 'The truth is ſuch pretences as theſe are, are fit only for a 'Church that hateth to be reformed; for if ſomething not good in it 'ſelf ſhould happen in any one Age to overſpread the viſible Communion 'of all particular Churches, this only makes a Reformation more neceſſa-'ry, ſo far is it from making it more diſputable. For thereby thoſe cor-'ruptions grow more dangerous, and every particular Church is bound 'the more to regard its own ſecurity in a time of general infection. And 'if any other Churches neglect themſelves, what reaſon is it that the 'reſt ſhould? For any or all other partciular Churches neglecting their 'duty, is no more an Argument, that no particular Church ſhould re-'form it ſelf, than that if all other men in a Town neglect preſerving 'themſelves from the Plague, then I am bound to neglect it too.

Page 540. 'Every Church is bound to regard her own purity and 'peace, and in caſe of Corruptions to proceed to a Reformation of 'them.

Page 541. Saint *Auguſtine* ſaith not only in that place, but in very 'many others, that Saint *Peter* did ſuſtain the Perſon of the Church, 'when Chriſt ſaid to him, I will give thee the Keyes of the Kingdom of 'Heaven.

'That he did *univerſam ſignificare Eccleſiam*, ſignifie the whole Church; and 'that thoſe things which are ſpoken of *Peter*, *non habent illuſtrem intellectum* 'nisi cum referuntur ad Eccleſiam, *cujus ille agnoſcitur in figurâ geſtaſſe perſonam*, 'have no clear ſenſe, but when they are referred to the Church, whoſe per-'ſon he did bear.

Page

Pag. 542 'He means the formal right of them was conveyed to the 'Church, and that Saint *Peter* was only a publick person to receive them 'in the name of the Church.

'It primarily and formally resides in the whole body of the Church.

'*Pag.* 544. His Lordship saith your opinion is yet more unreasonable; 'because no body collective, whensoever it assembled it self, did ever give 'more power to the representing body of it, than a binding power upon it self 'and all particulars; nor ever did it give this power otherwise than with this 'reservation in nature, that it would call again and reform, and if need 'were, abrogate any law, or ordinance upon just cause made evident, that 'the representing body had failed in trust, or truth. And this power 'no body collective, Ecclesiastical or Civil can put out of it self, or give 'away to a Parliament or Council, or call it what you will, that re-'presents it.

'His Lordship saith that the power which a Council hath to order 'settle and define differences arising concerning faith, it hath not by an im-'mediate institution from Christ, but it was prudently taken up by the 'Church from the Apostles example.

CHAP. II.

Some Animadversions on his Preface.

§ 1. THE impartial searchers after truth, have hitherto thought that a strict method (at least agreeable to natural Logick) is more effectual than confusion or wordy popular haranges: And that the controversie should be very cleerly stated before it can be profitably argued: And therefore that first all ambiguity of terms be by due explication removed, that men may not mean several things and not understand each other; and to *Define* and *distinguish* where it is needful, and then Affirm or deny, and then effectualy prove. But why this worthy person doth far otherwise with us, both before and now, it is more his part than mine to give the reason: I dare not say he cannot; *Nor* I dare not say, he can, but will not, but all that I can say is that *he doth not*, and I know not why.

§ 2. The Preface of his Book called *Unreasonableness*, &c. Is so much answered already by Mr. *Lob*, that I will not lose time by doing much to the same again: And there is a posthumous book of Dr. *Worsleys* called,

led, *The third part of naked Truth*, which hath ſtrenuouſly handled the ſame chief matter for Scripture Sufficiency againſt unneceſſary Impoſitions. It being ſuppoſed, though not there expreſſed. 1. That he ſpeaketh not againſt the guiding determination of undetermined accidents which muſt be determined one way or other: As Time, Place, Utenſils, Tranſlation-words, *Metres tunes*, &c. 2. And that a man that intollerably breakes Gods Laws (by Blaſphemy, Treaſon, Murder, Fornication, &c.) is not to be tollerated becauſe he erroniouſly thinks he keepeth them.

§ 3. His ſad ſaying [*that there is no improbability that the Jeſuites ſhould be the firſt ſetters up of the way in* England which he calls the Doctrine [*of Spiritual Prayer*] Mr. *Lob* hath opened, as it deſerveth, in part; but to ſay all that it deſerveth would ſeem ſo harſh, that I have reaſon to think that it would but more offend than profit him.

§ 4. For I find that he is grown too impatient with our *Nameing* what he patiently and confidently doth: The cauſe of his impatience I leave to himſelf. But that it is much within him I muſt conjecture, when in his defence of Biſhop *Laud* I read him ſaying to the Papiſts [*To ſpeak mildly, it is a groſs untruth.*] And yet wen I ſpeak not ſo plainly to him (and I think never more ſharply) he accounts it a *continuel Paſſion, Rage, Railing, Intollerable indiſcretion*, &c. Do I give him harder words than theſe? Yet I profeſs I ſmart not by them: I take them for very tollerable words, in compariſon of his miſcarriges in the cauſe in hand.

Several ſorts of men I have found think other men ſpeak in paſſion: 1. Thoſe that hear and read with paſſion; They think that which angers them came from anger. 2. Thoſe that are too high to be dealt with on even terms, and think the plain ſpeech which agreeth to others is a contempt of ſuch as them. 3. Thoſe that commit miſcarriages ſo groſs and defend cauſes ſo bad, as have no names but what are diſgraceful, and then take all that is ſaid to anatomatize their cauſe and errours, to be ſaid againſt them ſelves. With theſe and ſuch others, *Truth*, is not tollerable he raileth that confuteth them, and doth *Auriculas molles mordaci radere vero*. I profeſs I felt ſo little paſſion in writing that book which he ſaith was written *in one continued Paſſion*, that I think verily, I ſinned all the while, for want of a livelier ſenſe of the ſin and hurt which I was detecting by my confutation. But I confeſs it is my opinion that *Falſhood* of *Speech* may lie in deſcribing a thing *ſhort of Truth*, as well as in *going beyond it*: And that the *Truth of words* is their *Agreeableneſs* to the *matter* (and mind): And that *verba rebus aptanda ſunt*: And that he that writeth againſt *ſin* muſt call it ſin, and open the evil of it.

§ 5. His Preface giveth us hopes that we are ſo farr agreed in our end,

as

as to be both for God, for truth, for unity and peace and Love, and against Popery, and one would think this much ſhould go far towards our Concord. But, alas, all agree not what *Piety* is, or what Popery is, nor of the way to our ends.

If he think that to be againſt *Spiritual Prayer* would help us againſt Popery, 1. I would he would tell us, *which way*. If by reducing the Nonconformiſts to think *Formes lawful*; ſo do the Jeſuites: And he told us that they at *Franckford* took a Forme from *Geneva* as uſeful: And the preſent Nonconformiſts put their judgment out of queſtion an. 1660, and 1661. In their writings, offers and Formes Printed. But all that are for Formes are not for all things in *your Formes*.

2. And I would he would have better told us *what the Spiritual Prayer is*, which the Jeſuits firſt brought in and helpes in Popery. For hitherto it is the *Dead Ceremonious formality and Imagery* of Popery, deſtroying *Spirituality*, (by words not underſtood, Mummeries, Beads, Canting Stage workes) which hath alienated moſt Religious Proteſtants from them. I will. 1. Tell you what I take *Spiritual Prayer* to be; and then. 2. Deſire his judgment of it.

1. It is my judgment (if he know it to be erroneous, I crave his reaſons) 1. That Mans Soul is by ſin ſo depraved that it is morally unable without Gods Spirit, effectually to know, feel and deſire deliverance from his own ſin and miſery, and to deſire Gods Grace and Glory, above all worldly ſinful pleaſures.

2. That therefore ſuch deſires in act and habit muſt be wrought in us by the Spirit of God. And the whole work of Regeneration and Sanctification is a giving to the Soul that new Divine nature, Love and delight, which worketh by ſuch holy deſires. And that as the carnal mind is enmity to God, and cannnot be ſubject to his Law, and if any man have not the Spirit of Chriſt, the ſame is none of his; ſo to be Spiritually minded is life and peace, and God who is a Spirit will be worſhiped in Spirit and truth, and by this we know that we are the Children of God by the Spirit which he hath given us; For he promiſed to pour out the Spirit of Grace and ſupplication: And becauſe we are ſons, he hath given us the Spirit of his Son, by which we cry *Abba Father*: And this Spirit helpeth our Infirmities in Prayer: If theſe things be in the Papiſts Bible, I hope they are not therefore Popery. I ſuppoſe the Papiſts alſo own our God, our *Saviour* and our Creed.

3. The help in Prayer which we expect from the Spirit, is. 1. To illuminate us to know what we need and ſhould deſire and ask. 2. To kindle in us holy deſires ſincere and fervent, of what we ſhould ask.

3. To give us a true belief of and truſt in the Love of God, the interceſſion of Chriſt and the promiſes of the Goſpel, that we may pray in hope. 4. To give us thankful hearts for what we do receive, and fit with joy to praiſe the giver. 5. To ſtir up all theſe diſpoſitions to particular acts in the due ſeaſon: And to ſave us from the contrary. 6. And we believe that a mind ſo illuminated, and affections ſo ſanctified and kindled, have a great advantage above others *cæteris paribus* to expreſs themſelves in words: For. 1. A man that *knoweth* what to ſay can ſpeak it when the ignorant cannot? Doth not a ſtock of knowledge enable you to Preach without book? 2. Such a Soul will ſet it ſelf diligently to think what and how to ſpeak in ſo great a buſineſs, when the careleſs mind it not. 3. Love and delight are very ſpeedy Learners. 4. Fervent deſire ſets all the powers of the Soul awork, and is full and forward to expreſs it ſelf. Hunger can teach men eaſily to beg: Poor men ſpeak intreaties; Anger, Joy, every paſſion maketh and powreth out words, where there is prerequiſite ability.

4. We believe that he who by natural defectiveneſs or diſuſe cannot find words fitly to utter his own mind, may have the help of Gods Spirit in uttering ſuch words as he readeth or learneth of others; and (eſpecially in the caſe of *Pſalms* which are not of ſudden invention) if for Concord the Churches agree to uſe the ſame meet words, Gods Spirit may actuate their deſires therein.

5. We hold that this Holy Spirit, is as *Tertullian* ſpeaketh, Chriſts Vicar, Agent or Advocate, by preventing, operateing, Cooperating grace, thus to illuminate, Sanctifie and actuate believers, in all holy works, and eſpecially in prayer. And I could heartily wiſh that you would not be againſt ſo much, as *Spiritual Preaching*, *Spiritual Writing* and *diſputing*, and *living*, and not ſay that the Jeſuits brought them in.

6. I believe that we are Baptized into the name of the Holy Ghoſt as well as of the Father and the Son, believing that he is thus Chriſts Agent for all this work upon our Souls, and covenanting to obey him.

7. I believe that ſins againſt the Holy Ghoſt, eſpecially deriding or reproaching his great works, miraculous or Sanctifing, have a dangerous malignity.

8. I ſuppoſe that in all this, the faculties of mans own Soul are the natural recipients of the Spirits influx, and agent of the act which both cauſes effect: And that its as vain a queſtion, whether it be by the *Spirit or by natural faculties* that we pray aright, as whether it be God as *fons naturæ*, or mans natural powers which cauſe our natural acts? Or whether the Act of ſeeing be from the ſun or the eye? As if the ſame effect might

might not, yea muſt not have a Suprior and Inferior Cauſe?

9. Therefore as Gods Spirit witneſſing with ours that we are his Children, ſo Gods Spirit helping our infirmities in Prayer, ſuſpendeth not the exerciſe of our Spirits, or maketh our reaſon and conſideration needleſs, but actuateth them in their duty. Learning and ſtudying how to pray, is conſiſtent with the Spirits help in Prayer.

10 I never talkt of it with any Nonconformiſts who denyed that an hypocrite may without any *ſpecial* help of the Spirit, ſpeak all the ſame words in prayer without either book or form, wich another may ſpeak: The help of knowledge, hearing, uſe and paſſion may help him to words: Therefore they never take a man to be proved godly or ſinceer, by his bare words: but by the *grace* of Prayer, which is *holy deſire &c.* and not by the ſpeaking, gift, or habit.

11. But we think that it was not the Jeſuits that firſt ſaid, *out of the abundance of the heart the mouth ſpeaketh*; and though the tongue may lie, it is made to expreſs the mind, and we muſt judge of other mens minds by their words, till ſomwhat elſe diſprove them. And its natural for the Heart to lead the Tongue. And men are more affected by words which come from affection than by thoſe that do not: and Reading words written by another when we ſpeak to God, is not ſo natural a ſignification of *deſire* or other affection, as ſpeaking them from the preſent dictate of the heart; For any Child that can read may do the one, and it is not the uſual ſignification of ſerioufneſs in other actions. A beggar that ſhould only read his begging leſſon, or a Child or Servant that ſhould only read ſome words to his Father or Maſter, would be thought leſs ſenſible of his wants.

12. Miniſters ſhould be men better aquainted than the people, how to *ſpeak to God and man:* It is their office; and therefore it belongeth to them to chooſe the words which are fitteſt: and to ſet up a Miniſtry that can do neither, is to befriend the Prince of darkneſs againſt the Kingdom of Light, and to be a deadly enemy to the Church and Souls. And to ſet up a miniſtry that *need not do it*, but may *chooſe*, or is not obliged to it, is the way to ſet up a miniſtry that *cannot* do it. Let the Miniſters be bound to no more than to *Read*, and a few years will transform them to ſuch as *can* do no more than read. *Moſcovy* proveth that, and too many other Countries.

13. If it be praying freely from preſent knowledge and deſire, without a book or ſet form which you call *Spiritual prayer*, either you are for the uſe of it in the Pulpit or not. If you are, did the Jeſuits teach it you? or will you go on to follow them? If not, what a divided party

are

are the Conformiſts, while ſo many uſe it and pray ſpiritually? And what a Caſe is the Church of *England* in, that hath ſtill ſo many Miniſters that pray as the Jeſuits Diſciples? Or why do you ſo reproach your Church and Miniſtry?

14. Do you think that there is more force in the name of a Jeſuit to diſgrace *Spiritual prayer*, or in the name of *Spiritual prayer* to honour the Jeſuits? And do you not ſeem to prevaricate and highly honour the Jeſuits, on pretence of diſhonoring *Spiritual prayer?* If you had ſaid that the Jeſuits firſt brought in *Spiritual preaching*, and *diſcourſe* and *Spiritual living*, would it not have more *honoured them*, than *diſhonoured Spirituality?* Will freedom from *Spiritual-prayer* honour your Church? as *Seneca* thought *Cato*'s name would do more to honour Drunkenneſs, than Drunkenneſs could do to diſhonour *Cato?*

I am not ſuch an Antipapiſt, as to fall out with Father Son or Holy-Ghoſt, becauſe the Jeſuits own them. You do but help to confirm my charity, who have long thought that among the Papiſts, there are many perſons truly godly, though their education, converſe, and proud, tyrannical wordly Clergy, have ſadly vitiated them.

15. All prayers written or unwritten are made by ſome body. Thoſe that the Biſhops write down for us in the Liturgy, and for our Faſts, were made by their invention: Either they had the help of the Spirit in making them or not: If yea, then why is it not as Jeſuitical to *write* a Spiritual prayer, as to ſpeak one? If not, excuſe them that ſay Gods Spirit made not your Liturgy, nor are they Spiritual prayers.

16. And were it not too like high and dangerous *Pride*, if ſuch a one as Biſhop *Bancroft*, Biſhop *Laud*, Biſhop *Morley*, Biſhop *Gunning*, in a Convocation, or before every publick Faſt, ſhould be appointed to write the words of Prayer, and ſhould in effect ſay to all the moſt Learned Divines in *England* [*The Spirit cauſed us to write theſe prayers, and our meaſure is ſo ſure and great, that none of you may preſume to queſtion it, nor to think that you can pray Spiritually in any words of your own, but only in ours, at leaſt in the Aſſemby. The Spirit will help you if you ſay our words, but not your own.* It now cometh into my mind what may be ſome of the meaning of Biſhop *Gunning*'s Chaplain, Doctor *Saywell*, in his laſt Book, that *none hath power to ordain Biſhops, but they that have power to give the Holy Ghoſt for the work of their Office.* It may be it is, The Holy Ghoſt to write Doctrine Sermons and Prayers for all their Clergy to uſe. But do you not ſay alſo to the Presbyters *Receive the Holy Ghoſt?* If they have him, why cannot they ſpeak their own hearts in other words than yours? Is Spiritual prayer appropriated to your Liturgy, words or forms, any more than

than at the Council at *Trent* he was to the Popes inſtructions.

17. We all confeſs, that as all the actions of imperfect men, have their imperfections, ſo have all our prayers, and theſe are eaſily aggravated: Sudden free prayer, and book prayer, have both their conveniencies and inconveniencies: The queſtion is which *hic & nunc* hath the greateſt, and whether forbidding either be not worſt of all: I have named the conveniencies and inconveniencies of each in my Chriſtian Directory.

18. Experience telleth the world, that the daily ſaying over only the ſame words, and that read out of a paper impoſed by others, by one that no further ſheweth any ſenſe of what he doth, is not ſo apt as more free and well varied words in ſeaſon, to keep people from ſleepy ſenſeleſs prophanation, and praying as the Papiſts do with their Maſſes, Roſaries, and Beads: And the variety of Subjects preached on, and variety of occaſions, and all accidents require ſome diverſification of words and methods.

19. It is a work of reverence to ſpeak to the King; yet as it is lawful to write a Petition to him, ſo to ſpeak to him without Book. Judges have ſerious work to do, for eſtate and life, and yet they are truſted to ſpeak without preſcribed words; and ſo are Advocates, Lawyers, Ambaſſadors, Phyſicians, Philoſophers, and all men in their Profeſſions, except Miniſters and Chriſtians, as ſuch.

20. We know not why men may not be intruſted to ſpeak to God in the name of imperfect man without impoſed books and words, as well as to ſpeak to man from the moſt perfect God and in his name; in preaching. Mans actions will be like man. Nothing that is not divine and ſpiritual ſhould be ſpoken as from God and in his name. And as after our fruſtrated Treaty for Concord 1661. one of them (nameleſs) wrote a Book againſt free praying without an impoſed form in the Pulpit, and yet they never durſt forbid it to this day; ſo *I* know who ſhewed his deſire of a new Book of Homilies (of his own making its like) to have been impoſed inſtead of preaching, and of the old ones, on thoſe that had not ſpecial licenſe to preach. But intereſt ruleth the world: They durſt not ſo far diſgrace their Clergy, as to make them meer Readers, nor loſe the advantage of talking out of the Pulpit for their Cauſe, where none muſt contradict them.

Mr. *Lob* hath ask'd you already; whether our *Spiritual Prayer*, as you call it, or your Liturgy (and Biſhop *Gauſins*, and Dr *Taylors* Prayer-books, *&c.*) be liker to the Popiſh Maſs book, and many other Offices and Devotions? Indeed Mr. *Auſtins* hath ſo much gravity, as excepting his ex-

curſions to Saints, &c. it may compare with many of yours.

And for that ſort of ſpiritual Devotion, in which they flie too high, I have found more of it in the Friers, Franciſcans, Benedictines, &c. ſuch as *Barbanſon*, *Benedictus de Benedictis*, &c. than in the Jeſuits: And the Oratorians, *Phil. Nerius*, *Baronius*, and the reſt; and of their ſober or Religious men, as *Sales*, Mr. *Routi*, &c. and of old, *John Gerſon*, *Kempis*, &c. have more of ſpirituality than the Jeſuits. But enough of this.

§ 6. As to the reſt of his Prefatory diſcourſe of the Advantages of Popery. 1. We doubt not but the Papiſts play their game among all Parties, as far as they are able, and put on divers ſorts of Vizors. But doth he (that is a Hiſtorian) not know, that all over the world their cheif deſign is upon the Rulers and Leaders, and they Cry, *Fight neither againſt great or ſmall*, but to win one Court Card ſignifieth more than many others?

2. Doth he think the Papiſts take the Conformiſts or the Nonconformiſts to be nearer to them, and leſs againſt them?

3. Did the Papiſts think Biſhop *Lauds* reconciling deſign deſcribed by Doctor *Heylin*, (entertained by *Sancta Clara*, *Leander*, &c.) or the Parliaments fears of his introducing Popery in thoſe times, to be more againſt them?

4. Are they liker to help in Popery, that are ſo apt to be over-averſe to any thing that ſavours of it, in Doctrine, Diſcipline, and Worſhip, and account the Pope Antichriſt? Or they that hold as followeth. 1. (As *Grotius*) That *a Papiſt is but one that flatters the Popes, as if all were juſt that they ſay* and do (and ſo there are few Papiſts I hope in the World.) 2. *That the Church of* Rome *is ſound in Faith.* 3. And ſo *are all the General Councils, even* Trent. 4. That *Rome is the Miſtreſs of all Churches*; or as Biſhop *Bromhal*, that for Concord we muſt all *obey the Pope, as Patriarch of the Weſt, and* Principium Unitatis Catholicæ, *ruling according to the old Canons*, (a Foreign Juriſdiction) and all thoſe paſs for *Schiſmaticks*, that refuſe it (of which more after.) 5. That the validity of our Miniſtry muſt be proved by the derivation of it from the uninterrupted ſucceſſion of the Roman Ordainers and Church. 6. That the Church of *Rome* by that ſucceſſion is a true, though faulty Church of Chriſt, but ſo are none of the Reformed Churches which have not Biſhops, or have them not by ſuch uninterrupted ſucceſſion. 7. That the only way of the *Concord of Churches and all Chriſtians is* (ſaith Biſhop *Gunning*) *to obey the governing part of the Church Univerſal, in which* Collegium Paſtorum, *all the Biſhops of the univerſal Church*, in one *Regent Colledge, governing all the Chriſtian World per literas formatas.* 8. That its ſafer and better for the Proteſtants in

France

France to be of the *French* Church of Papiſts than to continue without Biſhops as they are. 9. That we ſhould come as near the Papiſts as the Greek Church doth, or as both Greek and Latin did at the rupture of the two Churches, or as in *Greg.* 1ſt. daies ſay others, or as in *Chſr. Mag.* daies, ſay others; receiving ſay ſome the firſt ſix General Councils, ſay others the firſt 8. 10. That we muſt amend the Oath of Supremacy for the Papiſts, as *Thorndick* ſaith, and ſo many Doctrines as he intimateth. 11. That its deſireable that the Papiſts had continued in our Churches as in the begining of Queen *Eliz.* And if they come (as Church Papiſts do) ſhould be received in our Communion. 12. That if the Pope have not (as ſome hold) a right of ſuch Primacy as belongs to Saint *Peters* ſucceſſour, at leaſt, His Primacy is a very prudent humane conſtitution. 1. That there may be a Common Father to care for all the Church. 2. And one to be a Head of Unity and order. 3. And one to call General Councils. 4. And one to rule between when there are no ſuch Councils (which are rare). 5. And one to give power to Patriarcks and Arch-Biſhops who elſe will have none over them to authorize, or Govern them. 6. And one to decide controverſies, when Countries, Churches and Arch-Biſhops diſagree. 7. And one to ſend out Preachers among Heathens, Infidels and Hereticks, all over the world. 8. And one boldly to reprove, admoniſh and, if need be, excommunicate Kings, which their own ſubjects dare not do.

I do not mean that all theſe things or any of them are the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, or held by all or moſt that conforme. But if ſome of it have been publiſhed by the Chief Prelates, and ſome by their chief defenders, and ſome in conference with us by Clergy men, I only ask whether all this pleaſe not and advantage not the Papiſts, more than Nonconformiſts any way do? And whether Arch-Biſhop *Uſher* and his Succeſſor Arch-Biſhop *Brombal*, Biſhop *Downam* and his Succeſſour Biſhop *Taylor* differed not as much as you and I do? And whether the multitude of Pariſh Prieſt that were Papiſts in Queen *Elizabeths* daies, and Biſhop *Godfrey Goodman* a Papiſts Biſhop of *Glouceſter*, with all the reſt mentioned by *Prin*, *Ruſhworth*, *Burnet*, &c. tell us not that the Papiſts had a hopeful game to play among the Biſhops and Clergy of the Church?

§ 7. As to his note out of Mr. *Jo. Humpheries* book, diſclaiming Cruelty to Papiſts, its known Mr. *Humphery* is a man of latitude and univerſal Charity, and tyeth himſelf to no party or any mens opinions: He openly profeſſeth his hope of the Salvation of many Heathens, and I ſo little fear the noiſe of the cenſorious, that even now while the Plot doth render them moſt odious, I freely ſay. 1. That I would have Papiſts uſed like men, and

no worſe than our own defence requireth: 2. That I would have no man put to death for being a Prieſt: 3. That I would have no writ *de excommunicato capiendo*, or any Law compel them to our Communion and Sacraments. For I would not give it them (if I knew them) if they came.

§ 8. As to his Accuſation of my firſt *Plea for Peace*, he hath it after, and it is after anſwered. And as to his Accuſation of my book for *Concord*, I anſwer. 1. Is it no Miniſters work, in a contending world, to tell and prove what are Chriſts ordained termes of Chriſtian Concord, but his that is [*Chriſts plenipotentiary on Earth, and were to ſet the termes of Peace and War*] Is this ſpoken like a peace maker and a Divine? Doth not he pretend alſo in his way to declare the terms of Concord?

2. But no man more heartily agreeth with him in lamenting the ſtate of the Church on earth, that when ſuch men as Biſhop *Gunning*, Dean *Stillingfleet*, Dr. *Saywel*, &c. on one ſide, and ſuch as I and many better men on the other ſide, have ſo many years ſtudied hard to know Gods will, I am certain for my ſelf, and I hope it of them, with an unfeigned deſire to find out the truth what ever it coſt, (and I profeſs as going to God, that would he but make me know that Popery, ſilencing Prelacy, impriſoning, Baniſhing, or ruining all Nonconformiſts, Anabaptiſts, Antinomians, Quakers, or any that ever I wrote againſt, are in the right, I would with greater joy and thankfulneſs recant and turne to them, than I would receive the greateſt preferment in the land) I ſay, that yet after all this we ſhould ſo far differ, as for one ſide to be confident that the others way of Concord is the ready way to ruin, wickedneſs and confuſion, and to come to that boldneſs to proclaim this to the world, alas how doleful a caſe is this?

What hope of Chriſtian peace and concord when ſuch excellent ſober well ſtudyed men as they, quite above the common ſort, not byaſſed by honour, or preferments or power, by Biſhopricks, Deaneries, Maſterſhips, plurality, or love of any worldly wealth, and ſuch as we that ſtudy and pray as hard as they to know the truth, are yet confident to the height that each others termes of Love and peace, are but Sathans way to to deſtroy them both, and introduce (as Dr. *Saywel* ſaith Conventicles do) Hereſie, Popery, Ignorance, Prophaneneſs and Confuſion: And what we are paſt doubt that their way will do, experience ſaith more than we may do.

Oh what ſhall the poor people do in ſo great a temptation!

§ 9. But I muſt paſs from his Preface, where I have noted. 1. That he is yet ſo peaceable as to propoſe ſome ſort of abatements for our Concord;

cord; that the benifit may be *ſibi & ſuis*, not reaching our neceſſities, but much better than nothing.

2. That they are ſo ill agreed, that Biſhop *Gunnings* Chaplain writeth, againſt it, making the only way of Peace to be by the ſword to force all men to full obedience to their Lordſhips in every thing injoyned, not abating an Oath, a Subſcription, a Covenant, a Word, a Ceremony, without Comprehenſion or limited Toleration.

3 And I could wiſh the Doctor would conſent, at leaſt that Lords and Parliament men may have the liberty themſelves of educating their own Sons, ſo it be in the Chriſtian Reformed Religion, and to chooſe their Tutors, and not confine them to Conformiſts only: The Papiſts are tollerated in chooſing Tutors for their Children: The King of *France* hath not yet taken away this liberty from the Proteſtants: Nor the Turks from the Greeks: And muſt you needs take it away from all the Lords, Knights, Gentlemen, Citizens, and Free-holders of *England*. Perhaps Beggars will conſent, if you will keep their Children, or do what the Godfathers vow. Moſt Gentlemen, that keep Chaplains, expect that they teach their Sons at home, ſometime at leaſt; what if a Lord or Knight have ſuch a Chaplain as *Hugh Broughton*, or *Ainſworth*, or as *Amſius*, *Blondel*, *Salmatius*, as *Gataker*, *Vines*, *Burges*, &c. muſt the Law forbid them to read Hebrew, Philoſophy, or Divinity to their Sons? I doubt you will ſcarce get the Parliament hereafter to make ſuch a Law to fetter themſelves, leſt next you would extend your dominion alſo to their Wives as well as Sons, and forbid them marrying any but Conformiſts.

Is it not enough to turn us all out of the publick Miniſtry? Methinks you might allow ſome the Office of a School-maſter, or Houſhold Tutor, or Chaplain under the Laws of Peace; unleſs the Sword be all that you truſt too: If it be, it is an uncertain thing: The minds of Princes are changable, and all things in this World are on the Wheel: when *Peter* flieth to the Sword, Chriſt bids him put it up, for they that ſo uſe it periſh by it: Hurting many, forceth many to hurt you, or to deſire their own deliverance, though by your hurt.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

The beginning of the Doctors unreaſonable Accuſations examined: His ſtating of the Caſe of Separation.

§ 1. THis much inſtead of an intelligible ſtating of our Controverſie he giveth us, *Page* 2. [*By ſeparation we mean nothing elſe, but withdrawing from the conſtant Communion of our Church, and joyning with Separate Congregations, for greater purity of worſhip, and better means of Edification.*] And may we be ſure by this, that we underſtand the difference.

1. Whether by [*Our Church*] he meant the Parochial Church, (and if ſo, whether ſome or all) or the Dioceſan Church; or the Provincial, or the National, or all I know not. But I know well, that ſome withdraw from ſome Pariſh Churches which joyn with others. And ſome think they withdraw not from the Dioceſan or Provincial, if they communicate with any one Pariſh Church in the Dioceſs: And ſome renounce the Dioceſan Church, which conſtantly joyn with the Parochial: And for the National Church, who can tell whether we have Communion with it, till we know what they mean by it? Indeed in the latter part, (after the long diſpute) he condeſcendeth beyond expectation to explain that term; But its ſo as plainly to deny that there is any ſuch thing as a Church of *England* in a Political ſenſe, that hath any conſtitutive Regent part: But even there ſo late he maketh it not poſſible to us to know, whether we be members of the Church or not: For he maketh it to be but all the Chriſtians and Churches in the Kingdom joyned by conſent expreſt by their Repreſentatives in Parliament, under the ſame civil Government and Rules of Religion (Doctrine, and Worſhip, and Government) 1. As it is a *Chriſtian Kingdom*, we are ſure, that we are members of it. 2. As it is all the Churches of the Kingdom conſenting to the Scriptures, yea, and to Articles of Doctrine, and all that Chriſt or his Apoſtles taught, we are ſure that we withdraw not from it: 3. But if every Chancellor, Dean, Commiſſary, Surrogate, *&c.* Or every forme or word or Ceremonie be eſſential to their Church, we cannot tell who is of it and who not? Or really whether any reject not ſome one forme, word or office? If every ſuch thing be not eſſential, he never in all the book tels us what is, or how to know it, or who is of it.

§ 2. And

§ 2. And the word [*withdrawing*] ſeemeth to imply former Communion: And if ſo, he maketh all the Anabaptiſts, Independants, Presbyterians, &c. Who never were of their Church, to be none of the Separatiſts here meant.

But if by [*withdrawing*] he mean [*not joyning in Communion*] either he meaneth in *the whole Communion or but in part*: If the whole, then the many thouſands that live in the Pariſhes and Communicate not in the Sacrament are no members of the Pariſh Church. And who knoweth then who are of their Church? And how few in many Pariſhes are of it, that yet paſs for Members of the Church of *England*? And yet I that joyn with them am none of it, in their account.

And. 3. What meaneth he by [*Conſtant Communion*] I go to the Pariſh Church when ſickneſs hindreth not, once a day; I go to the Sacrament, and am none of their Church. Thouſands go but rarely, and thouſands ſcarce at all, at leaſt to the Sacrament, and theſe are of their Church and no ſeparatiſts.

4. But perhaps the conjunction is explicative [*and joyn with ſeparate Congregations for greater purity*, and Edification: If ſo, then he that never joyneth with them nor any other is none of the intended ſeparatiſts. 2. Nor he that goeth to other Churches on other account; than for *purity of Worſhip and Edification* (As Papiſts that go as to the only true Church for the Authority).

§ 3. But the utter ambiguity is in the word *ſeparate*; And that you may underſtand it he explaineth it by repeating it. By *ſeparation* he means *withdrawing to ſeparate Congregations*. But the doubt is, *which are* the ſeparate Congregations. I named many ſorts of Lawful and unlawful ſeparations, but he will not tell us which he meaneth by any intreaty.

§. 4. I would my ſelf yet that I may be underſtood, tell the reader what ſorts of ſeparation I renounce and what I own: But I have done it ſo oft and largely, that I am aſhamed to repeat it, as oft as mens confuſion calls me to it. The reader who thinks it worth his labour, may ſee it done in my firſt *Plea for Peace*, and in the Preface to my *Cath. Theol.* and ſpecially in the beginning of the third Part of my *Treat.* of *Concord*, and in *Chriſt. Direct.* And he calls me here afterward to the ſame

Certainly it is only *ſinful ſeparation* that is in the queſtion; and as certainly there are many ſorts not ſinful. I am locally ſeparate from all Churches ſave that where I am. I morally ſeparate from the Roman Church as an unlawful Policy, and all other which are *in ſpecie* againſt Gods word: I ſeparate from ſome for Herefie as being not capable matter of a Church, while they own not all the Eſſence of Chriſtianity. I ſeparate from ſome

as

as impoſing ſin, and refuſing my Communion without it. I ſeparate from ſome as having no lawful Paſtors; ſome being uncapable matter, and ſome, being uſurpers that have no true call: I ſeparate from ſome only ſo far as to prefer a better *rebus ſic ſtantibus*; ſometime a better as to the Doctrine, ſometime as to the Worſhip, ſometime as to the Diſcipline ſometime and moſtly as to the Paſtors worth and work; ſome go from their own Pariſh, becauſe the Miniſter is very ignorant in compariſon of another to whom they go: ſome that hear the Miniſter preach againſt preciſeneſs and for Ceremonies, had rather hear another that calleth them to holineſs: ſome that have tollerable Preachers go to Doctor *Stillingfleet and* Doctor *Tillotſon* as better: ſome go for neerneſs to another Church. Some go from their own Pariſh becauſe the Miniſter cuts the Common-prayer too ſhort, and Preacheth too long; ſome becauſe they would have it ſo, go to ſuch: ſome becauſe the Parſon is an Arminian; others becauſe he is contrary. Some go to the Miniſter that is ſtrict in keeping the ſcandalous from the Sacrament: ſome therefore go from him: ſome remove their Dwellings or Lodgings for theſe ends; and ſome do not: ſome go from their own Pariſh for the benefit of the Organs in another. And of old, when Nonconformiſts had Pariſh Churches and uſed ſome part of the Liturgy, many went to them from their own Pariſhes. Some of theſe are lawful, ſome are unlawful: Moſt certainly they that go from their own Pariſhes, yea, or to Nonconformiſts Aſſemblies, in *London*, go not all on the ſame account: Nor doth the Doctor and ſuch other ſeparate from me as I am ſaid to do from them, but otherwiſe and much more.

§. 5. If he would firſt have told us what *Separation is ſinful*; ſecondly, and then have proved us guilty of it, inſtead of the confuſed talk of *Separation*, and a begging the queſtion by ſupoſing that to be ſinful, which he will neither diſcribe, nor prove ſuch, it had been of ſome uſefulneſs to our conviction. But I confeſs I never liked thoſe Phyſitians who give their Patients the Medicines that they are beſt ſtored with, or they can beſt ſpare, be the diſeaſe whatſoever; Nor the diſputer that poureth out what he is beſt furniſhed to ſay, how uſeleſs ſoever to the reader or to the Cauſe. Diſputeing ſhould not be like boys playing at *Duſt point*, who cover their Points in a great heap of Duſt, and then throw Stones or Cudgels at it, and he that firſt uncovereth them wins them. Duſty heaps of ambiguous words confuſedly poured out, befriend not Truth that ſhould be Naked, nor the reader.

§. 6. Some thought it was the *Place* called *Conventicle houſes*, which made the Conformiſts call us *Separatiſts*; and they got oft into Pariſh Churches and Chappells. But theſe were made the worſt of ſeparatiſts, and

and puniſhed the more. And doubtleſs it is not meeting at any of the new Tabernacles, nor at the *Spittle*, nor at *Sturbridge* Fair, where Preaching hath long been uſed, nor in a Priſon nor at the Gallows to Priſoners and People, which are faulty Separation.

§. 7. Some thought that they meant that its want of the Common-prayer that maketh us Separatiſts; and they have tryed and read the Common-prayer in their Aſſemblys: But theſe have been accuſed and ſuffered the more. And even Mr. *Cheny* was forced to fly his Country for reading it, and Preaching in an unlicenſed meeting. And ſome reading more and ſome leſs, by this it will not be known who are the Separatiſts; The old Nonconformiſts in their Pariſh Churches read ſome more, ſome leſs, and now ſome Conformiſts vary. They ſay a Conformiſt at *Greenwich* keepeth up a Common-prayer Conventicle; ſome Conformiſts are accuſed for overpaſſing much: One lately ſuſpended for wearing the Surplice too ſeldom, and refuſing to pray for [*our gratious Queen* and James *Duke of* York.] How much of this goeth to make a Separatiſt?

§. 8. Some thought it was want of the Magiſtrates leave that made them call us ſeparatiſts: But when the King Licenſed us, the accuſation was the ſame: yea Mr. *Hinkley* and many others tell you, that they took this for worſt of all.

§. 9. Some ſay it is want of the Biſhops Licence: But as Mr. *Tho. Gouge* hath his Univerſity Licence, and I have Biſhop *Sheldon*'s Licence (I think not invalidate) and yet this goeth for no juſtification of us; ſo is it with others.

§. 10. Some think that it is a Conventicle as deſcribed by their Cannon that muſt make us Separatiſts, which is of *men that call themſelves* of *another Church*. But that's not it: Mr. *Gouge*, Mr. *Poole*, Mr. *Humphrey*, and my ſelf, and abundance more that never gathered any Church, nor called our ſelves of any other then their own, are nevertheleſs ſeparatiſts in theſe mens account.

§. 11. They that remembred what was called *Separation* in *England* of old, ſuppoſed it had theſe two degrees, which made men called Browniſts. Firſt falſly taking the Pariſh Miniſters and Churches for no true Miniſters and Churches of Chriſt, and therefore not to be Communicated with. Secondly or (in the lower rank) falſly taking the faults of the Pariſh Miniſters and Churches to be ſo great, that its a ſin to have ordinary Communion with them. But they that have ſtill diſclaimed both theſe are *Separatiſts ſtill* in our Accuſers ſence.

§. 12. Some thought that *ordinary Communicating* in the Pariſh Churches and pleading for it, would prove us no ſeparatiſts with them. But this

will not ſerve as my own and many other mens Experience proveth.

§. 13. I am called after to ſay more of this: The ſum of my ſeparation is this. Firſt that I take not the Pariſh Churches to be the only Churches that I muſt Communicate with, and will not confine my Communion to them alone, as if they were a ſect, or All: But will alſo have Communion with *Dutch*, *French* or Nonconformiſts.

2. I take not the Order, Diſcipline and mode of worſhip in the Pariſh Churches, nor the Preaching of very many Parſons, Vicars and Curates, to be the beſt and moſt deſirable.

3. I take thoſe to be no true Political Churches, which have no Paſtors that have all the Qualifications, and Call, and Authority, which is Eſſential to the Office; and therefore can communicate with them, but as with a flock without a Paſtor, or an Oratory, Community or Catechized Company.

4. I live peaceably under ſuch Biſhops as have many hundred Pariſhes, and no *Epiſcopos Gregis*, true Biſhops and Paſtoral Churches under them, as they think: But I own not their Conſtitution.

5. I joyn with all the Churches in *England* as Aſſociated for mutual help and Concord in all that the Scripture preſcribeth, and in all the Proteſtant Religion, and all that all Chriſtian Churches are agreed in, and all that is truly needful to the ends of Chriſtianity: But not abſolutely in all, which their Canons, Liturgy &c. conttaine: Eſpecially their *ſinful Impoſitions*, and their Preſumtious *Canonical Excommunications* of diſſenters *ipſo facto*.

6. I am one of the Chriſtian Kingdom of *England*, as under the King according to the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy; and am for obeying the Laws and Rules in all things lawfully belonging to their Power to command. But not for obeying them in ſin, againſt God, nor for believing all to be Lawful becauſe they command it; nor for their taking down *Family Government* or *ſelf Government*, and diſcerning private Judgment of the ſubjects. This is my meaſure of ſeparation.

§ 14. And I think in caſes that concern our own and many mens Salvation we ſhould have leave freely to ſpeak for our ſelves; and not be uſed as we are, that muſt neither be endured to be ſilent, or to ſpeak. Let this Dr. open our caſe to you himſelf, ſaith he [Pref. p. 36. Speaking of my firſt Plea for Peace [*As though it had been deſigned on purpoſe to repreſent the Clergy of our Church as a Company of Notorious, Lying and Perjured Villains* for *Conforming to the Laws of the Land and orders eſtabliſhed among us: For there are no leſs than thirty tremendous aggravations of the ſin of Conformity ſet down in it and all this done without the leaſt provocation given on our ſide*] And elſwhere

where he ſaith he ſhall *leſs regard my aggravations.*

Anſ. 1. If I do that which you think as bad, I would gladly be told of it (though falſe accuſations I deſire not) And impenitence is too ſoon learnt without a Teacher or Academical degrees, and I had rather be ſaved from it. 2. But Reader I once more appeal to the Judgment of all reaſon and humanity as well as Chriſtianity, to decide the caſe of this Accuſation.

1. We did in, 1660. and 1661. All that we were able by labour petition and yielding as far as we durſt for fear of ſin and Hell, to have been united and lived in Church Concord with the Epiſcopal party.

2. When our labour and hopes were fruſtrate and two thouſand of us caſt out of the Miniſtery, and afterwards laws made againſt us as Conventiclers, firſt for our Fining, Impriſonment, and then Baniſhment, and after beſides Impriſonment to pay twenty pound the firſt Sermon, and forty pound the next and ſo on; when after this the Law that baniſhed us from all Cities, Corporations, *&c.* and places where we lately Preached, did moſt deeply accuſe us as the cauſe; I never wrote ſo much as the reaſons of our diſſent: When by the execution of theſe Laws we were by Informers and others uſed, as is well known, I was ſtill ſilent. My not conforming ſhewed my diſſent, but I durſt not ſo much as once tell them why, leſt it ſhould more exaſperate them.

3. At laſt I was often told that the Biſhop that firſt forbad my Preaching, and many others after him, oft ſaid to Great men, Mr. *Baxter* keeps up a Schiſm, and yet holds all our conformity lawful, ſave *renouncing a rebellious Covenant.* And I yet continued ſilent.

4. At laſt they wrote againſt us, that we *durſt not ſay that any part of Conformity was ſin, but only inconvenient.*

5. Then many Pulpits and books proclaim, *that we againſt our Conſciences kept up a Schiſm, for a baffled cauſe which we had nothing to ſay for.*

6. All this while Lords and Commons uſed to ask us, *what is it that you would have, and what keepeth you from Conformity.* [In private talk, but would never allow us to ſpeak for our ſelves and give the world or Parliament our reaſons].

7. Many years together Pulpits and Printed Books of the Clergy, cryed out to the Magiſtrates to execute the Laws againſt us, (and as one ſaid *ſet fire to the Fagot*); and blamed them for not doing it.

8. When the King gave us his Licence, they were greatly offended, as aforeſaid.

9. At laſt one great Biſhop told me that he *would deſire the King* to

conſtraine us to give our reaſons, and not keep up a Schiſm, and not tell for what. And another greater told me, that the *King took us to be not ſincere, that would not give our reaſons.* And all this while I durſt not give them, as knowing how they would be received.

10. When the Biſhops kept me from Preaching and gave me leiſure, I wrote. 1. An Apology for our Preaching, 2 A Treatiſe of Epiſcopacy and divers other ſuch, and yet durſt not Print them (nor indeed could do it.)

11. At laſt after about ſeventeen or eighteen years ſilence, by ſuch importunity (and the Preſs being more open) I ventured firſt but to write my firſt Plea for Peace, which only nameth matter of Fact, and our bare Judgment, enumerating the things which we think ſin, without our Arguments, leſt it ſhould provoke them more. And therein profeſſed that (knowing mens different Educations, ſtudies, intereſts, *&c.*) I did not by this accuſe the Conformiſts, nor the Law makers, but only tell. 1. What *I thought would be ſin in us*, 2. *And how great a ſin*, if we conformed.

Reader, ſhould I have ſtayed longer (the ſmal Tract of Sacrilegious deſertion of the Miniſtry, came out when we were licenſed, but ventured not to name the matters of our Nonconformity) what could we do leſs? I ſtaid till I think half the ſilenced Miniſters were dead. Is the call of ſuperiours, the Intereſt of our Miniſtry, and Conſciences of ſo little regard as that I muſt not tell men that ſo loud and long had asked, *whats the matter?* Muſt we neither be ſilent nor ſpeak?

And now ſee here. 1. If Dean *Stillingfleet* be a man to be believed in ſuch accuſations, [*All this was done by me, without the leaſt provocation on their ſide*] wonderful difference! Is my naming what I think God forbids me, ſo great a provocation to them, and is all this for ſeventeen years before named [*not the leaſt provocation* to us *on their part*? What ſhall one think could bring ſuch a man to ſuch a word?

2. And that which I profeſt that I wrote not to accuſe them, he tells you was [*as if deſigned to* repreſent them as a Company of notorious lying Perjured Villains. This Collection I feared; But how could I avoid it? Muſt not I tell them that urge me, what ſin I fear, leaſt they ſay *you repreſent us as ſuch?*

3. See here how they talk of us contrarily as the *Barbarians* of *Paul*, that now make him a Murderer, and anon a God; For many years together, our Lords and Maſters perſwaded men that we took Conformity to be no ſin, ſave renouncing the Covenant: And now how Contrary? Its the repreſentation of a Company of notorious, lying, perjured,

ed Villains, with thirty tremendous aggravations. *Repent O England*, ſaith *Bradford* at the ſtake. But who would have thought that Repentance had been ſo hard a work, in a caſe called ſo heynous, and that to the Preachers of Repentance, as it is either to *them or to us*, which ever it be that is found in the guilt.

CHAP. IV.

Of his Hiſtory of the caſe of the old Nonconformiſts.

§ 1. AS to what he ſaith of the ſameneſs of the former Caſe and ours, I ſhall tell him the difference after, where he more calls me to it; And ſhall ſhew him ſo much difference, as will diſcredit this aſſertion.

§ 2. As to the caſe of the old Nonconformiſts. 1. It muſt be premiſed that we take them not for any of our rule, but cleave to *Gods word* and the *example of the* Primitive Church, looking ſtill at the great ends of order and Government.

2. We maintain as well as he that the Chief Nonconformiſts were againſt that called *Browniſm* or Separation, and wrote more againſt it than the Conformiſts did.

3. I ſtill profeſs my ſelf to be of their Judgment in this, and have practiſed accordingly.

4. But they were not againſt ſuch Preaching, or any ſuch ſort of Separation as I have either practiſed or defended.

§ 3. Here therefore it muſt be known what the Controverſie between them and the ſeparatiſts was. 1. The higher ſort of ſeparatiſts ſaid, that the Church of *England* was no true Church. The Nonconformiſts, ſaid it was a true National Church both as a Chriſtian Kingdom, and as an Aſſociation of Churches, (and as repreſented in National Synods were they made one.)

2. The ſaid Browniſts ſaid that the Pariſh Churches were no true Churches, nor to be owned as ſuch, nor joyned with. The Nonconformiſts held that they are true Churches, (that have capable Miniſters) though faulty.

3. The ſeparatiſts ſaid that the Pariſh Miniſters were no true Miniſters, becauſe ordained by Dioceſans and not choſen by the people, *&c.* The Nonconformiſts ſaid, that the capable were true though faulty Miniſters,

owned by the peoples conſenting communion, and the ordination valid though culpable.

4. The ſeparatiſts ſaid that Miniſters and people muſt gather Churches that are purer, and ſet up better diſcipline in them, whatever Rulers ſay or do againſt it, or whatever they ſuffer, as far as they are able. The Nonconformiſts ſaid, this is to be done where it may be done without doing more hurt than good, but elſe it is no duty but a ſin, *viz.* To do it Tumultuouſly, Seditiouſly, or ſo as by running on the Magiſtrates ſword, by improbable attempts to loſe their own advantages for doing and getting good, and hinder the common pariſh reformation.

5. The Separatiſts ſaid that no prohibition of the Magiſtrate will warrant a Miniſter to forbear the publick work of his office. The Nonconformiſts held that it belongeth to the Magiſtrate to reſtrain deceivers and all falſe Teachers who do more hurt than good; and ſuch ſhould obey when they are forbidden to Preach and Adminiſter Sacraments: Yea if the Magiſtrate wrongfully forbid a worthy Miniſter to Preach, for order he is bound to obey, unleſs the need of the Church and Souls, and the probable benefit plainly weigh down that matter of order, and make the Magiſtrates prohibition invalid, as being againſt the common good, and the ends of the Miniſtry, and ſo againſt Chriſt.

6. The ſemi-ſeparatiſts (*Robinſons* party) after held that though the Pariſh Churches may be called true Churches, as a Leper is a true man, and it may be lawful to hear a Sermon in them, yet the Common-prayer is ſo bad, and the people and Miniſters ſo bad, and diſcipline ſo caſt out, that it is unlawful to joyn with them in Common-prayer, or Sacrament, or to become ſetled members of them; but all muſt attempt, though in Forreign Countreys, that are able, to ſet up purer worſhip and diſcipline. The Nonconformiſts held that thoſe that can have better without more hurt than good, ſhould chooſe it: But they that cannot may joyn in member-ſhip, Common-prayer and Sacrament, with ſuch Pariſh Churches as will admit them without their own actual ſin, and conſenting to their faults.

§. 4. I ſhall now give you ſo full proof that the Nonconformiſts were for more, which the Doctor calleth *Separation*, than my Preaching or practice ever reached to, as I ſhall tell the Reader, what credit this Doctors hiſtory deſerveth, and what inhumane uſuage the Nonconformiſts have from that ſort of men.

§. 5. *Anno* 1593. Was printed againſt them Biſhop *Bancroft's* book called, *Dangerous Poſitions* and *Proceedings* &c. Or *Engliſh Scotizing* for *Diſcipline by force* &c. In the firſt book he maketh their Reformations

ſo

ſo odious, as that *Page* 30. He ſaith that in *Scotland* [*it hath wrought more miſchief in Thirty years, than the Pope of* Rome *had done before, as I think, in five hundred*] you ſee how that Spirit then did work, and whether our Arch-Biſhop *Bancroft* thought better of the Presbyterian Churches or the Pope, and the Effects.

In the Second book he taketh up what raſh words he could from any indiſcreet men to make them odious.

In the third he ſheweth what the Engliſh Nonconformiſts did for their Church-way and Diſcipline. *Chap.* 1. *p.* 42. He ſaith that the firſt Ten or Eleven years of the Queens Reign they ſo clamoured *&c.* that they divided themſelves from their ordinary Congregations, *and meeting in houſes, woods and fields, kept there unlawful and diſorderly Conventicles*: and Mr. *Cartwright* defendeth them, *ſaying, that the name of Conventicles was too light and contemptuous for them*; Then they framed their two admonitions: In one of which *p.* 60, 61. They tell the Parliament that their Diſcipline was *Gods order, and they muſt in Conſcience ſpeak for it, and uſe it.* And *Anno* 1572. They erected a Presbytery at *Wandſworth.* The Elders are named. The perſons named that ſet up meetings are Mr. *Field*, *Wilcox*, *Standen*, *Jackſon*, *Bentham*, *Sancler*, *Crane*, *Edmonds*, and after *Clark*, *Travers*, *Barber*, *Gardiner*, *Cheſton*, *Crook*, *Egerton.* *Anno* 1582. There was a meeting of threeſcore Miniſters out of *Eſſex*, *Cambridg-ſhire* and *Norfolk* at *Cock-field*, Mr. *Knewſtubs* Town. And another that year at a Commencement at *Cambridge.*

Chap. 3. That they drew up a book of their Diſcipline, where choice of Miniſters, Elders, Deacons *&c.* are named and regulated, and for Claſſical, Provincial, Comitial Synods and Government. *Chap.* 4. He tells you how they proſecuted it *Anno* 1583. Out of *Cholmley*, *Field*, *Fen*, *Wilcox*, *Axton*, *Gellebrand*, *Wright*, *Gifford.* *Chap.* 5. How they proceeded. 1587. And 1590. *Northampton-ſhire* was divided into three Claſſes. Firſt the *Northampton* Claſſis had Mr. *Snape*, *Penrie*, *Sibthorp*, *Edwards*, *Littleton*, *Bradſhaw*, *Lark*, *Fleſhward*, *Spicer &c.* The *Daventrie* Claſſis had Mr. *Barebon*, *Rogers*, *King*, *Smart*, *Sharp*, *Prowdloe*, *Elliſton &c.* The *Kettering* Claſſis had Mr. *Stone*, *Williamſon*, *Falkſbrook*, *Patinſon*, *Maſſey &c.* And *Johnſon* ſaith it was received in *Warwick-ſhire* *Suffolk*, *Norfolk*, *Eſſex*, and moſt parts of *England*; ſo *Smith*, *Hawgar*, *Holme* witneſs, Mr *Snape* ſaid. About *Braintree* the Claſſis had Mr. *Culverwel*, Mr. *Rogers*, Mr. *Gifford*, (one of our Doctor's wittneſſes) *&c.* That at *Colcheſter* had Doctor *Chapman*, Doctor *Chrick*, Mr. *Dowe*, Mr. *Farrar*, Mr. *Newman*, Mr. *Tey*, *&c.* *Page* 85. Mr. *Snape* ſaid, It was agreed

greed on in the Classical and general assemblies, that the dumb Ministers were no Ministers, and that all the Ministers should Preach for the aforesaid Government.

Chap. 6. Anno 1588. A Synod at *Coventry* agreed against private Baptism, reading Homilies, the Cross in Baptism, and that the faithful ought not to communicate with unlearned (they mean uncapable) Ministers; *though* they may be present at their Service, if they come of purpose to hear a Sermon. For Laymen may read publick Service. That the calling of Bishops *&c.* is unlawful. That it is not lawful to be ordained by them, or denounce their Suspentions or Excommunications. That its not lawful to rest in the Bishops deprivation of any from the Ministry, except on consultation with neighbour Ministers and their flock, it seems so good to them; but that he continue in the same till he be compelled to the contrary by Civil force. &c. And the Discipline subscribed by *Cartwright*, *Fen*, *Wright*, *Oxenbridge*, *Gellybrand*, *Clevely*, *Nutter*, *Fetherstone*, *Holm*, *Lord &c.* To repeat all is too tedious.

But its worth the noteing that whereas the Prelatists usually say, that *when they were put to draw up a Liturgy themselves, they could not agree of any*, Bishop *Bancroft* saith *Page 96, They offered the Parliament a book of their own, containing the form* of *Common prayers* &c. *and hoped to have* had it established.

Page 164. *Chap.* 12. He tells you of their order for *Parents to offer their own* Children to Baptism, and be Godfathers *&c.* He proceedeth to shew that they resolved to practice their Discipline against the Magistrates will, and did accordingly. And *Chap.* 15. *p.* 120. That they joyned themselves into an Association or brother-hood, and appropriated to their meetings the name of the Church, thereby shewing themselves to be most notorious Schismaticks, citeing their words (our Churches) And *p.* 121. That the Parish where they preach assembled, is not the Church properly in their sence, but as many thereof only as are joyned to them with that inviolable bond, *viz.* The desire of the godly Discipline, and those furthermore who leaving their own Parish Churches come to them. e. g. *The Church* of God, forsooth in *Black fryars* consists besides that Parish of a number of men and Merchants wives dispersed here and there throughout the whole City. Mr. *Snape's* testimony is cited.

§ 6. By these words of *Bancroft* and the case compared, it is certain that on these suppositions many of the Canons were made against them; as against Conventicles and calling themselves another Church, and a brother-hood, and about God fathers and many more, supposing them to be of this mind.

§ 7.

§ 7. On ſuppoſition that theſe things were true, the Nonconformiſts have to this day been accuſed by thoſe that write againſt them, and the teſtimony of this book alledged as proof. And Doctor *Heylin* hath in *folio* accordingly deſcribed them in his Hiſtory of Presbytery, as many others have done.

§ 8. And now cometh Doctor *Stillingfleet*, and tells you, that [*he is certain that all the old Nonconformiſts*] were quite of another mind, and other men, and to prove it citeth four or five mens words againſt Browniſts; When yet he citeth more of my own againſt Separation: and if my words prove me not to be againſt it, how will theirs prove them to be againſt it?

§ 9. Either *Bancrofts*, *Heylins* and ſuch others words of them are true or falſe. If *true*, how untrue are Doctor *Stillingfleet's*? If falſe, O what a ſort of men were theſe Prelates that ſo ſtigmatized and accuſed and ſo uſed ſo many hundred ſuch men, on ſo falſe a charge? And what a Church was it that made the Canons againſt them on that ſuppoſition? And how ſhall we know which of them to believe? Doth not Doctor *Stillingfleet* heavily reproach his own Church for ſuch uſuage of them?

§ 10. The caſe is commonly known, Firſt that a long time they had almoſt all of them Pariſh Churches as other men had: and they ſought to ſet up Diſcipline in thoſe Churches. And it had been folly then to gather others in other places.

2. When *Bancroft* and others had got many caſt out and ſilenced, a great part of them kept in by connivence of ſome peaceable Biſhops, and by the mediation of ſome Lords and Gentlemen, ſuch as the Earl of *Leiceſter*, *Bedford*, *Warwicke*, the Lord *Burghley*, Sir *Francis*, *Walſingham*, Sir *Amias Pawlet*, Sir *Nicholas Bacon*, Mr. *Beal*, and Sir *Francis Knowles* had been to them before: Yea the greater part of them by ſuch favour got into priviledged peculiar places, or little Chapells at leaſt; *Few* Counties had not ſome Gentlemen that ſheltred them. The Earl of *Huntington* kept in Mr. *Hilderſham* at *Aſhby*, Mr. *Slater* and Mr. *Aſh*, even in the big Town of *Bremicham*, Mr. *Mainwaring* kept in Mr. *Ball* at *Whitemore*; Mr. *Knightley* kept in Mr. *Dod*, Judge *Bromley* (and his humble holy Lady) kept Mr. *Brunſkill* at Sheriff *Hales*, and entertained many more (Mr. *Nicols* &c.) Sir *Richard Graves* at *Moſeley* had Mr. *Pateman* and divers others, ſeldom without a Nonconformiſt: One would think Doctor *Stillingfleet* ſhould know that his own Patron, under whoſe wing he lived, Sir *Roger Burgonie* was ſeldom without a Nonconformiſt at *Roxhall* in *Warwickſhire*: Mr. *Hering* had long liberty at *St. Marins* in *Shrewsbery*, Mr. *Ford*.

(who wrote on the *Pſalms*) had the School Lecture there, Mr. *Atkins* at *Tipton*, kept in to the laſt, even the Lord *Dudley*, favouring him. Abundance ſuch I might name, Mr. *Barnet*, at *Uppington* (whom I oft heard Catechize Dr. *Alleſtree*,) Mr. *Tandy* at *Bewdley*, Mr. *Langley*, Mr. *Paget*, Mr. *Hind*, Mr. *Lancaſter*, Mr. *Rowle*, Mr. *Nicols*, Mr. *Mather*, Mr. *Rathband*, Mr. *Barbon*, Mr. *Gee*, Mr. *Wright*, Mr. *Smart*, &c. had their liberties for ſome time. And when one Biſhop ſilenced them, the next oft gave them liberty (as Biſhop *Bridgman* did after Biſhop *Mortons* ſilencing ſome) and when they were ſilenced, they went oft into another Dioceſe, where they rubd out a year or more, and then to another; And ſo were ſtill in ſome hope of publick liberty.

And when ſilenced they uſed to keepe private faſts; And where they lodged to preach on pretenſe of expounding to as many as they could.

They obeyed the Biſhops as Magiſtrates, but not as Paſtors.

They knowingly broke the Law in their private and publick Miniſtry: They obeyed not the Canons; uſed not much of the Liturgy; And many of them did as ſome do now, get into publick Pulpits for a day and away, where they were not known.

§. 12. But yet there are more undeniable evidences of the falſeneſs of what, he ſaith, he is certain of, as the judgment of *All the Old Nonconformiſts*. One is the known judgement of the Scotch Reformers, and the common accuſation of the Engliſh, as being of their mind. He that will affirm that the Scotch Presbyterians thought it unlawful to preach or hold Aſſemblies, when forbidden by Magiſtrates or Prelates, will incur a very ſharp cenſure from their own Leaders, who have written ſo many Books, which charge them with the contrary, aud make them Rebels and Seditious for it: Such as *Bancroft*, *Heylin*, *Beziers*, and multitudes both old and new; eſpecially theſe laſt twenty years.

And though the Nonconformiſts in *England* did not juſtifie all that the Scots did (and they that took *Knox*, *Buchanan*, *Melvin*, and ſuch other for very pious men, yet thought ſome words and deeds too raſh, eſpecially *Knox*'s publick opening the Queens faults in the Pulpit, and refuſing her offer to come at any time, and tell her of them privately) yet its known, that in the Rules of Diſcipline, they were moſtly of the ſame judgment: And they often joyned in defending the ſame Cauſe. See their ſeveral demonſtrations of Diſcipline, and the ſeveral Defences of them, how little they differed, when *Bancroft* preacht againſt them at *Pauls Croſs*, *Feb.* 8. 1588. An Engliſh man wrote a *Brief* Diſcovery of his untruths, &c. And a Scoth man *J. D. Bancrofts raſhneſs in railing againſt the Church of Scotland*, printed 1590. And how little differ they, if at all (and Dr. *Reignolds*

Reignolds wrote a Letter againſt it to Sir *Francis Knowles*, printed with Sir *Francis Knowles* his account to the Lord *Burleigh* of his Speech in Parliament, againſt the Biſhops keeping Courts in their own names, as condemned by Law.

And in many of their writings the Engliſh own the Scotch Diſcipline and Church. And yet even theſe Scots have rejected *Brown* as a Schiſmatick, and the Engliſh Confuter of *Bancrofts* Sermon tells him, *Pag.* 43, 44. Brown *a known Schiſmatick is a Fit man to be one of your Witneſſes againſt the Elderſhip : His entertainment in* Scotland *was ſuch as a proud ungodly man deſerved to have : God give him and you repentance.* And *Giffords*, *Pagets*, *Bradſhaws*, *Brightmans*, *Rathbands*, *Balls*, &c. words againſt the Browniſts proved not them to be againſt their own doctrine and practice, no more than the Scots rejecting *Brown* proved them againſt theirs.

§ 13. And another proof is the common doctrine of the Nonconformiſts, of the difference of the Magiſtrates, and the Churches Offices. The ſaid confutation of *Bancroft* hath it, *pag.* 45 and forward, and abundance of their publick writings; *viz.* That the Magiſtrate only hath the power of the Sword, and of Civil Government, and to reſtrain and puniſh Miniſters that offend by Hereſie or otherwiſe: But that as Preaching, Sacraments and the diſciplinary uſe of the Keys are proper to the Miniſtry, ſo the deciding of Circumſtantial controverſies about them and about the due ordering of them, doth primarily belong to Eccleſiaſtical Synods. Therefore if theſe Synods were for their Preaching, they were not for ceaſing it meerly in obedience to the Magiſtrate that ſilenced them.

§ 14. And it is proved by the many Volumes which they wrote againſt the Power of our Dioceſans, that it was not any Eccleſiaſtical Authority of theirs (which they thought it a ſin to diſobey.)

§ 15. And Mr. *Fox*, a Nonconformiſt and many more of them, own the Doctrine of *Wicliff* and *John Huſſe*, and the *Bohemians*, for which the Synods of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, condemned them, who affirm that it is a heynous ſin to give over Preaching, becauſe men excommunicate us, and that ſuch are excommunicated by Chriſt.

§ 16. And it is not nothing that the moſt Learned Conformiſts agree with them, as I have oft cited Biſhop *Bilſons* words, that the Magiſtrate doth not give us our power, nor may hinder our uſe of it, but is appointed by God to protect and encourage us, and if he forbid or hinder us, we are to go on with our work and patiently ſuffer.

And even now I believe moſt of the Leading Clergy think that if a Synod bid us preach and hold aſſemblies, and the King forbid it, we are

to obey the Synod rather than the King. Mr. *Thorndike*, and many others that write for the Church thought ſo. And Mr. *Dodwel* thinks ſo even of a particular Biſhop. The difference then is but this: One party giveth this power to a Synod of Biſhops (and Presbyters perhaps conjoyned) and the other to a Synod of Parochial Paſtors, Doctors and Elders. But both agreed that the Magiſtrates prohibition in that caſe is not to be obeyed. And the Conformiſts will not take it well if I ſhould ſay that the Nonconformiſt are more for obedience to Magiſtrates than they: I ſtill except the *Eraſtians*, and ſuch as own Dr. *Stillingfleets* Irenicon.

§ 17. There is a moſt conſiderable book called *A Petition directed to her moſt Excellent Majeſty ſhewing a meane how to compound the Civil Diſſentions in the Church* of *England*, where the Author (I ſuppoſe ſome Lawyer) *Pag.* 23. tells us what was the difference between the Papiſts and them that deſired Reformation (Nonconformiſts) about the power of Magiſtrates. *And.* 1. *They give the Prince Authority over all Perſons Eccleſiaſtical whatſoever; The Papiſts exempt the Clergy:* 2. *They hold that a Prince may depoſe a Prieſt, as* Solomon *did* Abiather, *and accordingly they obey being ſilenced: The Papiſts deny it.* 3: *They affirm, if the Prieſts make wicked decrees, the Prince may enforce them to better. The Papiſts deny it.* 4. *They ſay Princes muſt and ought to make Laws for the Church, but with the adviſe of Godly Paſtors: The Papiſts deny it.* 5. *They hold that if the Paſtors be unlearned and ungodly, the Prince may of himſelf without their adviſe, make Orders and Laws, for Eccleſiaſtical matters: The Papiſts deny it.* 6. *They will ſubcribe in this point to the Articles of Religion eſtabliſhed by Law; to the Apology of the Church of* England, *to the writings of* Jewel, Horn, Nowel, Whitaker, Bilſon, Fulk. *They take the Oath of Supremacy.*

Here the ſecond Article ſeemeth to be contrary to what I have ſaid. But the book whence he citeth it (*de diſcipl. Eccleſ.*) and all their writings ſhew, that it is but the ſame that I ſay, which they aſſert, *viz.* That Princes ought to reſtrain or ſilence intollerable men, and ſuch Uſupers or dilinquents as give juſt cauſe. 2. That if they miſtake and do it unjuſtly, we muſt leave Temple and Tyths to their will. 3. Yea, and forbear our own publick Preaching when the publick good on the account of order and peace requireth it; but not when the publick good, and the neceſſity of Souls, and our own opportunities require the contrary. And the ſilenced that ſubmitted ſtill, went on to exerciſe their Miniſtry againſt Law in that manner as beſt conduced to its ends.

And what this Auother ſaith of the Papiſts, I ſuppoſe many of the higheſt Prelatiſts come nearer then the Nonconformiſts; and were the Prince againſt them, would obey the Biſhops before him.

And the ſame book deſcribing the Nonconformiſts in twenty Articles *p.* 55. in the 8*th.* thus expoundeth it [*They teach* that *neither the Miniſters nor people ought to make any* general *Reformation, with force and armes,* or *otherwiſe of their own authority change any laws made* or *eſtabliſhed* for *Religion* by *Authority of Parliament: But they hold that the general Reformation doth belong to the Magiſtrates as Gods Lieutenant: and that for themſelves they may and ought in dutiful ſort both Preach and Write, and ſue to the Magiſtrates for redreſs of Enormities, and alſo practiice the ordinances of Chriſt which he hath commanded his Church to keep to the end of the World.*

And Article 20. *It is not all the unprepared Pariſh that they would have brought under Diſcipline: but thoſe of each Pariſh who are prepared and willing.*]

§. 8. In ſhort the *demonſtration*, the *ſupplication*, the *humbe motion to the Council*, and almoſt all the Nonconformiſts writings ſhew, that. 1. Their great Cauſe was to ſet up Pariſh Diſcipline, under Superior Synods. 2. Being themſelves almoſt all in publick Churches, at leaſt *per vices*, and being ſtill in hope of publick reformation, they were greatly againſt the Browniſts violence, that would break thoſe hopes. 3. They held that Chriſts Law was their Rule, which commanded this Diſcipline, which no Magiſtrate could diſpenſe with. 4. But that Magiſtrates muſt be obeyed in ſuch ordering of Church matters as belong to them. But not in forbearing ſuch exerciſe of the Miniſtry as was needful to its ends, the Churches good. And as its ſaid, they practiſed accordingly.

I. The Browniſts denyed the truth of the Pariſh Miniſtry and Churches, and the lawfulneſs of Communion with them. II. The Semiſeparatiſts held it lawful to hear them preach, but not to joyn in the Liturgy and Sacrament. And this is it that *Phil. Nye.* wrote for.

III. The Presbyterians and meer Nonconformiſts thought it lawful, and meet in thoſe Pariſhes which had capable Miniſters, to joyn in both Liturgy Sermons and Sacraments, where ſin was not impoſed on them. But ſo (as though forbidden) while they had publick Churches, to do their beſt to practice Chriſts Commands and Diſcipline, and where they could have none to further the ſame ends as effectually as they could, in the opportunities left them. But never took it for their duty to leave all their Miniſtry or publik preaching meerly in obedienc to the laws: much leſs to the Biſhops.

When all this is ſo notorious, and when I knew the minds of many aged Nonconformiſts about forty years agoe as my familiar friends, who were all of the ſame mind in this as I am, what hiſtory can I be more aſſured of, than, as I ſaid, that Firſt, They took not praying

publickly and gathering Aſſemblies to be therefore ſinful, becauſe it was forbidden by the Law. 2. But to be a ſin againſt Prudence and the ends of their Miniſtry, when it was like to do more hurt than good, by exaſperating the Prince, and depriving themſelves and others of better advantages for thoſe holy ends; 3. And that it was a duty when it was like to do more good than hurt: 4. And therefore they broke Laws where they could be endured, even in Chappells and Pariſh Churches.

§ 5. And it is not inconſiderable that the reaſons why *Calvin, Bullinger, Zanchy, Beza*, ſaid what they did for ſubmiſſive forbearing publick Preaching and Church gathering, were Firſt, Becauſe as they ſaw that the Prince was reſolved not to ſuffer it, ſo Reformation was then but begun, and the Prince and Magiſtrates were the pricipal means of it, and they had great hopes that what could not be done at preſent to perfect it, might be done afterwards at a fitter time. King *Edward* was fain to quiet the ſeditious Papiſts by making them beleive that Latin and Engliſh, was the great difference between the former Maſs worſhip and the Liturgy: Aftertimes had no ſuch neceſſity: and tumultuouſly to diſturb the Magiſtrate in his prudent progreſs of Reforming, had been to ſerve the enemies of Reformation.

But in our times, Parliaments (who the Doctor *S.* ſaith, are intruſted to Conſent for us) have theſe fifty years told the Kingdom that the Reformation was growing backwards, and the increaſe of Popery by favour and publick tolleration deſigned, and much accompliſhed; and Plots threatned the reſtoring of it: and if Parliaments deceived us, yet the chief Actors themſelves were to be believed: Doctor *Heylin* maketh the ſyncretiſm and cloſure with them in the boſom of the now indulgent Church, to be Arch-Biſhop *Lauds* very laudable deſigns. Arch-Biſhop *Bramhal*, ſaith *Grotius*, was to have held ſome place among us, as a Proteſtant, and was of the Engliſh Biſhops mind, and he himſelf doth ſay the laſt; and I have ſhewed in his own words that *Grotius* took *Rome* for the Miſtris of all Churhces, and that there was no way for the Union of Proteſtants, but to joyn in Union with *Rome*, and that he owned the Doctrine of the Councils even of *Trent* it ſelf, requiring but the *amending* of the *Clergies lives*, and the caſting by the *Schoolmens bold diſputes*, and the reſtraint of the Popes Government to the Rule *of the Canons*, ſecuring the *rights of Kings and Biſhops*, and this he ſaith will content the peaceable: *Vincentius* wrote a book called *Grotius Papizans*; *Saravius* in his Epiſtle upon ſpeach with *Grotius* laments it as too true: His friend *Dion. Petavius* told Mr. *Ereskin* an honourable perſon attendant

dant on the King, that *Grotius* reſolved to have declared himſelf for the Church of *Rome*, if he had returned alive from the Journy that he dyed in. See Mr. *Thorndikes* juſt weights, what he was for.

And how far many Doctors of this Church, ſome yet living, have maintained that *Grotius* principles are not Popery, and conſequently what ſuch mean by Popery when they diſclaim it, I need not tell you, while ſo many of them have publiſhed it in print; And are not Mr. *Thorndicks* termes of Concord in Councils till the eight hundredth year much like and much more in book aforeſaid?

And ſurely there is great difference between ſuch Preachings as were like to be the ruin of the begun Reformation by exaſperating a Reforming Magiſtrate, and ſuch Preaching as tendeth to ſtop the revolt of a reformed Nation, when Parliaments and the Agents themſelves of the revolt, proclaim the danger.

Its true that there was then a greater ſcarcity of Preachers than now: And that was the Nonconformiſts argument with the Biſhops when they pleaded for publick liberty: But its as true that they had far greater hopes of that Liberty, which it had been folly to caſt away, for leſs: But it is not ſo with us; we are a greater number than they, and have new Laws to ſhut us out not only of the Churches, but of Corporations, and Biſhops that will give us no ſuch liberty.

§ 6. And indeed ſo many were the unlearned Pariſh Prieſts, and ſo bad, in Queen *Elizabeths* daies, being many of them lately ſilly Maſs Prieſts, that the ſhame of the Church and the cry of the Proteſtant people forced the Biſhops to tolerate moſt of the Nonconformiſts in ſome publick Church, eſpecially thoſe that were moderate and did not publickly oppoſe them. Dr. *Humphery* was allowed Reigus Profeſſour in *Oxford*: Dr. *John Reignolds* Preſident of *Corpus Ch. Col.* Mr. *Perkins*, Lecturer in *Cambridge*, Mr. *Paul Bayne* after him, ſo Dr. *Chadeorton* there, *&c.* ſome tell men that theſe were all Conformiſts, and of the Church; And yet I am none that am of the ſame mind. The truth is, they were for ſubmitting to kneeling at the Sacrament, Surplice and moſt of the Liturgy, rather than ceaſe Preaching: But they were againſt ſubſcription, and the Engliſh ſort of Dioceſan Biſhops and Government, and the impoſed uſe of the Croſs, as it is in Baptiſm: As Tradition tells us, and as you may partly ſee in Dr. *Reynolds* Letter to *Sir Francis Knowles*, in Mr. *Baynes*, Dioceſans Tryal, his Letters, and in *Fuller* and other Hiſtories, And Mr. *Deering*, Mr. *Greenham*, Mr. *John Fox*, Mr. *Marbury*, *Dudley*, *Fenner*, Mr. *Knewſtubs*, yea I think ſix or ten to one, were endured

dured in publick Churches long, before they were hindered; And when they were hindered, they ſpake peaceablely and intreatingly, and were ſtill in hope of publick Liberty, and were oft petitioning or making great Friends to the Biſhops to that end much they long obtained and more they hoped for. How long Mr. *Travers* was kept in at the Temple, is commonly known.

§ 7. It is neither conſiſtent with my leiſure, nor the buſineſs now in hand, nor I ſuppoſe the patience of moſt readers, that I ſhould prove this further by a Voluminous tranſcribing Hiſtories already extant. If the Book which Dr. *St.* citeth called *part of a Regiſter* be peruſed, he will find, 1. That the paſſage cited by the D. was the reprehenſion of many Londoners taken at a meeting in an open Hall of a Company, which meeting they avowed: Is this a proof that they were againſt ſuch publick meetings, or for it? When for it they lay in many Priſons.

2. That they profeſſed that they forſook not the Publick Churches, till their Teachers were ſilenced and turned out: So little doth ſilencing tend to union.

3. That yet theſe being ordinary Citizens, ſpake many things weakly, crying out too raſhly of the Rags and Ceremonies of Antichriſt: But he might have found many things in the Regiſter more worthy his communication: For inſtance.

1. The Letter of Dr. *Wy:* In the beginning. 2. Dr. *Pilkington* (after Biſhop of *Durham*) his Letter of weighty reaſons againſt ſilencing the Nonconformiſts. 3. Mr. *Edward Deerings* anſwer to the Articles put to him, twice: with ſober and Peaceable words. 4. Mr. *Greenhams* modeſt and peaceable Apology to the Biſhop of *Eli*, againſt Conformity, yet refuſing to give his Reaſons, leſt they ſhould provoke till he were conſtreined (as I did ſeventeen years). All which ſhew that the Nonconformiſts then were moſtly in poſſeſſion of ſome publick Churches, or but newly turned out, and in hope of reſtauration. And what is all this to our caſe of total and peremptory excluſion?

§ 8. And methinks the Doctor ſhould not deſire to tempt the Reader that tryeth his citations to read the reſt of that Regiſter: *viz.* 1. The harſh uſage of Mr. *Johnſon*, who dyed in priſon, driven into too ſharp Language by their uſage. 2. The exceptions of Mr. *Crane*. 3. The Miniſters complaint to the Councils; 4. Eſpecially the Councils Letter to the Juſtices on the behalf of the Miniſters, worthy to be peruſed at this time. 5 A notable Treatiſe called a Letter to a Londoner, againſt the Legality of the Biſhops proceedings. 6. The Comons complaint for a Learned Miniſtry, ſhewing what a ſhameful ſort of men were kept in by the biſhops, while

while the Nonconformiſts were turned out and ſilenced. 7. The practiſes of the Prelates. 8. The Petition to the Queen and that to the Convocation. 9. Mr. *Marburys* conference with the Biſhop of *London*, and his Arch-Deacon. How the Biſhop railed and ſwore at him, and reviled him for deſiring that all Pariſhes ſhould have Preachers, as if Homily Readers were not enough. And yet Mr. *Marbury* was ſo moderate that at laſt with liberty of interpretation (like *Chillingworths*) he conformed. 10. Mr. *Dudley Fenners* defence of the Miniſters againſt Dr. *Bridges* ſlanders: Written but a month before his death, whereas the ſaid *Fenner* was far from unlearned (as his *Methodical Theologia* ſhews) and was ſo moderate that Dr. *Ames* ſaith he much conformed at laſt; but it ſeems not enough: and he ſheweth how the Biſhops ſet themſeves againſt ſuch Preachers. 11 Mr. *Gawtons* troubles. 12. *Dudley Fenners* Counter-poyſon, or certain form of Eccleſ. Government and its defence. 13. The demonſtration of of diſcipline. Doth the Dr. believe indeed that theſe writings ſignifie that the Nonconformiſts of thoſe times thought it a ſin to Preach *eo nomine* becauſe forbidden?

§ 9. They wrote indeed a great deal more againſt ſeparation than he citeth, and more than all the Conformiſts did. And yet they were not more againſt it than Biſhop *Bilſon*, who ſaith, *If the Magiſtrate forbid us our work we muſt go on, and patiently ſuffer.* Mr. *Hilderſham* was called *Malleus Schiſmaticorum*, and yet he and I are Schiſmaticks with theſe men: Mr. *John Pagets* Arrow againſt ſeparation, Mr. *Bradſhaw*, Mr. *Gifford*, Mr. *Ball*, &c. have ſaid enough. But he that knoweth their controverſie knoweth that it was none of the queſtion, whether it be lawful to Preach when the Magiſtrate forbids it, or whether our Pariſh Churches and Dioceſan be to be prefered before more Reformed Churches when they may be had? But whether. 1. The Pariſh Churches be no true Churches? 2. Or ſuch as it is unlawful to communicate with occaſionally? 3. Or conſtantly when no better can be had without greater hurt than benefit? 4. Whether it be a duty to gather Churches or Preach publickly when it is like to do more hurt than good, by the Magiſtrates oppoſition? 5. Whether we ſhould not quietly bear with that in a Church which we cannot reforme, while no ſin is put on us, and the Communion of it is no woſſe than that of our Pariſh Churches? In all theſe they were againſt the ſeparatiſts; and ſo am I. 6. Yea they pleaded the duty of obeying the Magiſtrate by forbearing to Preach when their Preaching was not neceſſary: And ſo do I.

§ 10. One would think they that take Homilies for Sermons, ſhould confeſs that the Nonconformiſts writing againſt the prohibition of the

Law, was a Preaching, or much more: as it is more publick. And did the Nonconformists *write when forbidden*, ſo much as *Cartwright*, *Parker*, *Sandford*, *Fenner*. *Gilby*, *Ames*, and aboundance more have done; yea and writ againſt Dioceſanes and Conformity as theſe and *Bradſhaw*, *Nichols*, *Brightman*, *Bayne*, *Travers*, and aboundance more have, even many hundreds, as the Millinary Petition and the Country Complaints *&c.* ſhew; and yet did theſe men every one of them take it for ſin to Preach, becauſe it was diſobedience? But nothing will convince ſome men.

§ 11. But I appeal to the reaſon and humanity of mankind, into what hands the ſilenced and perſecuted Miniſters are fallen? Is it humane firſt to charge them with reſiſting the Laws, by Preaching, gathering Churches, and adminiſtring Sacraments, and making Canons and ſetting up new Diſcipline, and to publiſh this to the land and world by ſuch Authority as Arch Biſhop *Bancroft*, Doctor *Heylins &c.* till it is become their Common Charge to render them ſuſpected and odious and till this be taken for undoubted truth: And yet when it may ſerve for the ſilencing of us, to maintain it with *Dr. St.* as that which he is *certain* of, that *the old Nonconformiſts* were againſt ſuch Preaching and aſſembling. At this rate we have been hitherto accuſed and confuted.

Yea upon the foreſaid Accuſations their Canons were formed againſt the Nonconformiſts, forbidding their Aſſembling, Preaching, calling themſelves a diſtinct Church, and a great deal more ſuch: and yet now the men that conform to theſe Canons are certain that they were made upon ſafe ſuppoſitions, and not one of the Nonconformiſts were ſo guilty.

But doth not the Doctor thus grievouſly accuſe the Church which he would defend? Were they ſuch men 1. that would ſo falſly accuſe the Innocent 2. and uſe them ſo cruelly on ſuch falſe accuſations, many of them dying in Priſons, and many lay there long *&c.* 3. and to form Canons on ſuch falſe ſuppoſitions?

§ 12. And I do not think I ſhall prevail with him to tell me, whether he that thinks their Caſe and ours was ſo much the ſame, doth verily believe 1. That if they had been in the Plague at *London*, and ſeen the forſaken people crowding for inſtruction to prepare for death, the Nonconformiſts (ſuch as *Bradſhaw*, *Gifford*, *Hilderſham*, *Greenham*, *&c.*) would have refuſed to Preach to them.

2. And if the next year they had ſeen the Churches burnt, and the City in ruins, and few Pariſh Miniſters officiate, they would have thought it a ſin to Preach to the deſolate City, to aſſemble them to worſhip God;

God; and would have let them under ſo dreadful judgements, live and dye like prophane Atheiſts?

3. And if ſhortly after the King had Licenſed them to aſſemble and Preach, would they have refuſed it as a ſin?

4. And if the Prelates had prevailed by ſuch a Parliament againſt the Kings Licenſe, and he ſtill had ſhewed the clemencie of his mind by his conivence, and Magiſtrates were loth to execute the rigorous Laws, and people would not inform, and the informers repented, and thouſands more called to the Nonconformiſts for help, than did there when Popery ſtuck ſtill in the peoples hearts; would they have thought all this no alteration of the Caſe, to judge whether their Preaching would do good or hurt?

§ 13. He tells us of the fewneſs of Nonconformiſts in King *Edward's* days. And it is a wonder that ſo many in ſo ſhort a time, went ſo far in the Reformation as they did. But ſo faſt were they then in progreſs, that even the Reformation of Church Laws then by the Commiſſioners agreed on was in many things ſo much better than our Canons, as could we now but obtain the ſame, would go far to heal us. Let me inſtance in ſome, and anticipate by it my anſwer to his after diſcourſe againſt Pariſh Diſcipline.

1. *Cap.* 18. *de Hereſ.* They determine of the Salvation of the unbaptized Infants of believers, the contempt only being damning.

2. They define the Church viſible (*Cap* 22,) *to be the Congregation of all believers in which the Sacred Scripture is ſincerely taught*, and *the Sacraments (at leaſt in the neceſſary parts) adminiſtred according to Chriſts inſtitution*] But your Canons deny all ſuch here to be true Churches, ſave theirs, as ſettled by Law.

3. De Sacram. Cap, 5. *None to be admitted to the Sacrament till in the Church he have profeſſed his faith.* And de Div. Offi. Cap. 7 *They that will receive the Communion muſt the day before come to the Miniſter* that he *may have time to execuſſe their Conſciences*, and *deal with them if they have done any thing ungodly* or *ſuperſtitiouſly, in which the Church* is *offended; and alſo may try their faith, that ſo he may either correct their ignorance, or terrifie their Contumely, or confirm their doubting. For none ought to be admitted to the Holy table of the Lord, that hath not a perfect belief.*] The words need a gentle expoſition: but we have no power now to try mens knowledge or belief thus.

4. Cap. 10. *After evening prayers*, the *Pariſh Miniſter Deacon and Elders with the people, ſhall call thoſe that have been publickly perverſe*, and *ſcandalous to confeſs their ſins, and to be publickly corrected, that the*

Church may be conformed by their wholeſome correction. And the Miniſter and Deacon with ſome Elders ſhall conſult how the reſt that are of vitious lives, may firſt by brotherly love according to Chriſts preſcript in the Goſpel, be dealt with by ſober men; whoſe admonitions if they receive, they ſhall give God thanks: But if they go on in the Crime, they ſhall be ſharply puniſhed as the Goſpel preſcribeth.]

5. De Concion. Cap. 3. *Preachers ſhall name no guilty perſon before the multitude, unleſs ſuch as have contemned Eccleſiaſtical Admonitions*] *ſuch may be named.*

6. De Exc. *Excommunication for none but horrible Crimes, &c. Cap.* 4. and after oft admonition. But you Excomunicate all Godly men that do but ſay your Conformity is not lawful, *ipſo facto* by your Canon.

7. Cap. 6. [*We permit not the power of Excommunication to be in any one perſon: Though the conſent of the whole Church be ſpecially deſirable, yet becauſe it is hard to gather and take it, let Excommunication thus proceed, that the* Arch-Biſhop, Biſhop, or *other lawful Eccleſiaſtical Judge, call one Juſtice of peace, and the Miniſter of the place where the guilty perſon dwelleth, or his deputy, and two or three other Learned and well manered Presbyters, in whoſe preſence, when the matter hath been moſt diligently handled and gravely weighed, the ſentence* of *Excommunication ſhall paſs.* Cap. 7. *And be written.*

Cap. 16 There is written a large pious form like a Sermon to be uſed at the Reconciling of the penitent, and his form of confeſſion, and petition to be received, and then the Paſtor of that Church is to ask all the flock, whether they will *forgive the offender and pray for him*, and *whether they will have him received into their Congregation as a brother. And then the Paſtor is to exhort the penitent, and then abſolve him* (*A great and ſolemn* work, moſt unlike your Diſcipline). And then to give God *thanks* and *pray for him and the Church.*

Should we now but move for thus much in order to concord with the Conformiſts, we have reaſon to think no importunity could prevail for it; were the conſequents of our diviſion as diſmal as they are now by moſt proclaimed. Yet verily we are moſt unexcuſeable wretches, if we have learned no more to this day than they did in ſo few years; or under full power and opportunity will reſiſt that good, which they that wanted ſuch opportunity wiſhed for; and go back as faſt as they went forward.

§ 14.

Sect. 14. To *p.* 8. [I never ſaid that the troubles at *Frankford* were ſo much about *free* or *formal Prayer*, as that the Presbyterians refuſed all forms.]

Sect. 15. *p.* 19. He confeſſeth that [*Whittingham, Sampſon, Gilby* and others, *accepted of preferment and employment in the Church, the Biſhop ſhewing them kindneſs for their forward zealous Preaching*;] and this being without their ſubſcribing to conform, is it any wonder then that they gathered not Aſſemblies elſewhere? Had the Biſhops ſo tryed us, we ſhould never have put them to talk ſo of our ſeparation, (but might have done our beſt to build more Churches.) Doth none of all this difference their caſe and ours?

Sect. 16. *p.* 20. He confeſſeth when [*they were ſilenced, they began to have ſeparate Meetings*,] and yet were all the old Non-Conformiſts againſt ſuch.

Sect. 17. As to *Beza*'s Letter, have not I ſaid more againſt Separation than he doth? Doth the Dr. think the Reader ſo blind as not to ſee that *Beza*'s words are juſt of the ſame importance with the account I gave, and contrary to his, *viz.* [*He trembleth at the thoughts of their exerciſing their function againſt the will of the Queen and Biſhops, for ſuch reaſons as may be eaſily underſtood, though we ſay never a word of them:*] Its eaſie indeed to ſee what he trembles at, and why he named them not, which he would ſure in charity have done, had it been becauſe it is ſinful diſobedience to preach when forbidden: It was eaſie to ſee what hurt it would have done in the ruine of Preachers and hearers, and ſhaking all the begun Reformation: Its not ſo with us, *Gualter* and *Zanchy* ſay not ſo much againſt Separation as I do, nor *John Fox*, nor *Bullinger* whom he citeth; we ſay the ſame.

Sect. 18. The ſame I ſay of *Parker* and *Gifford*, and I again tell him that he may name many more; *Hilderſham, Paget, Ame, &c.* I am of their judgment in their oppoſition to the Browniſts; but it is a notorious untruth (*pag.* 33.) that the *force of all the Non-Conformiſts reaſonings againſt Separation, lay in two Suppoſitions. 1. That nothing could juſtifie Separation from our Church, but ſuch corruptions which overthrew the being and conſtitution of it, &c.* And 1. It muſt be remembred that *Separation* being a word of very many ſences, they held indeed that [*none ought to ſeparate from a Church accuſing it to be none, but for that which proved it to be none.*] 2. But did they deny that which all the Chriſtian World confeſſeth? *viz.* 1. What if our Engliſh Divines gathered by Biſhop *Hall* againſt *Burton*, be in the right, that the *Church of Rome is a true Church, as a Thief is a true man*, (though I think otherwiſe) muſt not ſuch Biſhops or Conformiſts therefore ſeparate from them?

Church may be conformed by their wholesome correction. And the Minister and Deacon with some Elders shall consult how the rest that are of vitious lives, may first by brotherly love according to Christs prescript in the Gospel, be dealt with by sober men; whose admonitions if they receive, they shall give God thanks: But if they go on in the Crime, they shall be sharply punished as the Gospel prescribeth.]

5. De Concion. Cap. 3. *Preachers shall name no guilty person before the multitude, unless such as have contemned Ecclesiastical Admonitions*]*such may be named.*

6. De Exc. *Excommunication for none but horrible Crimes, &c. Cap.* 4. and after oft admonition. But you Excomunicate all Godly men that do but say your Conformity is not lawful, *ipso facto* by your Canon.

7. Cap. 6. [*We permit not the power of Excomunication to be in any one person: Though the consent of the whole Church be specially desirable, yet because it is hard to gather and take it, let Excommunication thus proceed, that the* Arch-Bishop, Bishop, or *other lawful Ecclesiastical Judge, call one Justice of peace, and the Minister of the place where the guilty person dwelleth, or his deputy, and two or three other Learned and well manered Presbyters, in whose presence, when the matter hath been most diligently handled and gravely weighed, the sentence of Excommunication shall pass. Cap.* [illegible] *written.*

Cap. 1 [illegible] to be used [illegible] session, a[illegible] Church is t[illegible] *pray for him as a brother him (A gr[illegible]* to give God Should [illegible] with the [illegible] could prevail for it; were the consequents of our division as dismal as they are now by most proclaimed. Yet verily we are most unexcuseable wretches, if we have learned no more to this day than they did in so few years; or under full power and opportunity will resist that good, which they that wanted such opportunity wished for; and go back as fast as they went forward.

IRREGULAR PAGINATION

§ 14.

Sect. 14. To *p.* 8. [I never ſaid that the troubles at *Frankford* were ſo much about *free* or *formal Prayer*, as that the Presbyterians refuſed all forms.]

Sect. 15. *p.* 19. He confeſſeth that [*Whittingham, Sampſon, Gilby* and others, *accepted of preferment and employment in the Church, the Biſhop ſhewing them kindneſs for their forward zealous Preaching*;] and this being without their ſubſcribing to conform, is it any wonder then that they gathered not Aſſemblies elſewhere? Had the Biſhops ſo tryed us, we ſhould never have put them to talk ſo of our ſeparation, (but might have done our beſt to build more Churches.) Doth none of all this difference their caſe and ours?

Sect. 16. *p.* 20. He confeſſeth when [*they were ſilenced, they began to have ſeparate Meetings*,] and yet were all the old Non-Conformiſts againſt ſuch.

Sect. 17. As to *Beza*'s Letter, have not I ſaid more againſt Separation than he doth? Doth the Dr. think the Reader ſo blind as not to ſee that *Beza*'s words are juſt of the ſame importance with the account I gave, and contrary to his, *viz.* [*He trembleth at the thoughts of their exerciſing their function againſt the will of the Queen and Biſhops, for ſuch reaſons as may be eaſily underſtood, though we ſay never a word of them:*] Its eaſie indeed to ſee what he trembles at, and why he named them not, which he would ſure in charity have done, had it been becauſe it is ſinful diſobedience to preach when forbidden: It was eaſie to ſee what hurt it would have done in the ruine of Preachers and hearers, and ſhaking all the begun Reformation: Its not ſo with us, *Gualter* and *Zanchy* ſay not ſo much againſt Separation as I do, nor *John Fox*, nor *Bullinger* whom he citeth; we ſay the ſame.

Sect. 18. The ſame I ſay of *Parker* and *Gifford*, and I again tell him that he may name many more; *Hildersham, Paget, Ame, &c.* I am of their judgment in their oppoſition to the Browniſts; but it is a notorious untruth (*pag.* 33.) that the *force of all the Non-Conformiſts reaſonings againſt Separation, lay in two Suppoſitions. 1. That nothing could juſtifie Separation from our Church, but ſuch corruptions which overthrew the being and conſtitution of it, &c.* And 1. It muſt be remembred that *Separation* being a word of very many ſences, they held indeed that [*none ought to ſeparate from a Church accuſing it to be none, but for that which proved it to be none.*] 2. But did they deny that which all the Chriſtian World confeſſeth? *viz.* 1. What if our Engliſh Divines gathered by Biſhop *Hall* againſt *Burton*, be in the right, that the *Church of Rome is a true Church, as a Thief is a true man*, (though I think otherwiſe) muſt not ſuch Biſhops or Conformiſts therefore ſeparate from them?

2. What if a Church impoſe ſome Lye, falſe Oath, or Subſcription, or ſome actual Sin in Worſhip, as a condition *ſine qua non* of her Communion; is it not lawful to ſeparate into better Aſſemblies?

3. What if they put down all preaching ſave reading ſome dry Homilies, and all Diſcipline, is it not lawful elſewhere to ſerve God better? But of this more after where he repeateth it. The Browniſts caſe was quite other before deſcribed.

Sect. 19. to *p.* 36, 37. We alſo hold that whoſoever ſeparateth from the Church of *England*, 1. As having not that Preaching and Sacraments which are of neceſſity to Salvation. 2. Or as not profeſſing true ſaving Faith, doth by conſequence ſeparate from all Churches in the world; becauſe they have all the ſame Word, Sacraments, and Chriſtian Faith. And to this Mr. *Jacobs* Argument is good, *p.* 38. (though he was the man that anſwered *Downam's* Sermon for Biſhops, and eſteemed one of the firſt Independents:) And Mr. *Balls* words to the ſame purpoſe, and the ſecond Suppoſition *p.* 39. we grant, and think verily that the late Conformiſts have ſaid more againſt the truth of the Church of *England*, than we; yea, that we are the defenders of it againſt the Browniſts and them, *Ball*, *Bradſhaw*, *Gifford*, *Hilderſham*, &c. cited by him, defend it as we do, and better than ſuch as Dr. *Heylin*, *Thorndike*, Mr. *Dodwel*, and ſuch others. Did he think any of this concerned me?

Sect. 20. Yes, for *p.* 74. he ſaith, [*We would blind the Reader by finding out the diſparity of ſome Circumſtances; but not one of us can deny that it was their judgment, that the holding ſeparate Congregations for worſhip, where there was an agreement in Doctrine and the ſubſtantials of Religion, was unlawful and ſchiſmatical.*]

Anſw. Its pity ſo ſeeing a Dr. ſhould tempt men to be ſo blind, 1. As to think all the differences which I have named, inconſiderable. 2. And to go on to abuſe themſelves and others, with the ambiguous word [*Separate*] no better explained. 3. And to think the other cauſes before and after named of ſome ſort of Separation, to be inſufficient; and I am ſorry for the Dr. if this be his own Profeſſion, that he would tell any lie, or commit any other ſin, or forſake any other part of Religion, rather than ſeparate to other Aſſemblies, from a Church that agreed in Doctrine and the ſubſtantials of Worſhip with him. The Presbyterians then are ſure of him, if they were but in poſſeſſion; and it ſeems in *Moſcovy* he would forſake preaching. But what if the King licenſed a preaching Church, would he refuſe the uſe of it for fear of ſeparating from a mere reading Church.

This *Protean* word [*ſeparate*] ſerveth for many uſes: I will put one caſe more to the Dr. (not feigned.) A Conformiſt Gentleman was of

the

the opinion that his Pariſh Church was no true Church, becauſe the Vicar was a Socinian, and another becauſe the Parſon was ignorant of the eſſentials of Chriſtianity; and they go to the next Pariſh Church. A Nonconformiſt in the ſame Pariſh, goeth to a Nonconformiſts Chappel, but doth not accuſe the Pariſh Church as none, as the other do; which of theſe ſeparateth more? At *Glouceſter* one took the Dioceſan Church for no true Church, becauſe Biſhop *Goodman* was a Papiſt, and the Biſhop is a conſtitutive part; and yet this man was for Dioceſans: A Nonconformiſt went to a Nonconformiſts Church, but would not ſay the Dioceſan Church was none: Which ſeparated more? He *ſeparateth* from his Pariſh Church againſt the Canon, who goeth from an ignorant ſcandalous Reader, to communicate with a Preacher at the next Pariſh: He ſeparateth from the Pariſh Churches, who judgeth them true Churches, but having the Kings Licenſe, joyneth conſtantly with the French, Dutch, or Nonconformiſts as better, ſtill owning mental communion where he hath not local; and he ſeparateth from the French, Dutch, or Nonconformiſt Churches, who thus leaveth them (as true Churches) to joyn with the Church of *England* as better. Many and various are the ſorts and degrees of Separation, and not all lawful or all unlawful: None of theſe are the Browniſts ſeparation, which the old Nonconformiſts confuted; which conſiſted in a denial, 1. That the Engliſh Miniſters were true Miniſters. 2. And their Churches true Churches. 3. Or ſuch as a Chriſtian might lawfully live in communion with in ordinary worſhip. 4. And therefore they were all bound to renounce them, and ſet up others.

I doubt the Dr. is far more a Separatiſt than I, and ſuch as I; for I am for Communion with all Chriſtians, as far as they ſeparate not from Chriſt; and I hate the falſe accuſing of any Church as if it were none, or its Communion unlawful. I can be but in one place at once, but in heart I joyn with all Chriſtians on earth except in ſin; and locally I joyn where I ſee greateſt reaſon for it, preferring that which I judge moſt agreeable to Gods word, ſo far as I may without greater hurt. But the Canonical Conformiſts, unchurch all the Churches here but their own, and utterly refuſe Communion with them, even with thoſe that refuſe not Communion with them. And ſome think that forcible ſilencing, fining, excommunicating, and impriſoning, is not the gentleſt ſort of ſeparating.

But doth he in all his Book do any thing to ſatisfie any mans Conſcience, that would know from what Churches he may or may not ſeparate? Not a word that I can find, that decideth ſuch a doubt. His two words here uſed are [*Agreement in Doctrine, and ſubſtantials of Religion,*] whereas 1. Religion is in *Acts* and *Habits*, and hath no proper *ſubſtance*, and what

his term [*Subſtance*] meaneth, till he tells us, none can know. It muſt be either an *eſſential* part, or an integral part, for an *Accident* I ſuppoſe it is not. If only an *eſſential* part, what Chriſtian dare ſay that I may ſin againſt all the meer integrals of Religion, rather than go from the Church that impoſeth ſuch ſin upon me. If it be all the integrals that we muſt agree in, then we differ in no one part of *Religion*; for *Accidents* are not *parts*: And then who contradicts him? When men differ in no part of *Religion*, they will not ſeparate unleſs merely locally: Are all the things named in my firſt *Plea*, no *parts* of Religion? It may be by [*Subſtance*] he meaneth only the greater ſort of *Integrals*, but how ſhall we know where to fix our meaſures; what duty is ſo ſmall that I may omit it, or what ſin ſo ſmall that I may commit it for Communion.

2. And as for *Doctrine*, they that differ in any part of Religion, are ſuppoſed to differ in the doctrine about that part. But can any man tell *what Doctrine* it is that he maketh our agreement in to be neceſſary, or the teſt of Communion. If I ſhould ſeparate from all Churches from which I differ in any the leaſt doctrine, I know not where the Dioceſan or National Church is that I might hold Communion with: Do all the Conformiſts agree in all doctrines? If it be in all that *the Law impoſeth*, how various, mutable, and uncertain is that.

I diſtinguiſh between *Doctrine profeſſed by the Church*, and *Doctrine impoſed on me to profeſs it*. As to the firſt, I will communicate with a Church that hath twenty falſe Doctrines, conſiſtent with the eſſentials of Chriſtianity and Church Communion. As to the ſecond, I will not knowingly *profeſs one falſe Doctrine* for Communion with any Church on Earth.

Did not the Nonconformiſts differ from the Conformiſts, in the Doctrine of the ſufficiency of Scripture for regulating Church-Order and Worſhip; and about the Divine Right of *Dioceſans* and Elders, and about Pariſh Diſcipline. Do not we now differ about the *undoubted certainty of the ſalvation of all dying baptized Infants?* Will this warrant a ſeparation?

[illegible] 21: P. 76. He tells us very confidently that *diverſity of circumſtantial pretences* for *Separation*, alter not the caſe: But 1. Its true that if twenty men have twenty falſe pretences for Separation, none of them are thereby juſtified; but if one man have a juſt cauſe, it juſtifieth him: I named very many juſt and unjuſt cauſes in my Plea, and he giveth no anſwer to it. 2. Are they ſuch circumſtances before named: Oaths, Declarations, Subſcriptions, Doctrine, *&c*? 3. What if the Law ſhould change, and allow of various Churches? what if the King licenſe them? Theſe be but circumſtances: What if the Plague drive away the Pariſh Miniſters? what if the Churches be burnt and the people forſaken? will no ſuch circumſtances

ſtances make other Aſſemblies lawful, becauſe he calls them *ſeparate*.

Sect. 22. *p.* 78. His undertaking is repeated: [He is *certain that preaching in oppoſition to our eſtabliſhed Laws, is contrary to the Doctrine of all the Nonconformiſts of former times.*] *Anſw.* If I have not proved the contrary, I cannot prove that they were Engliſh men.

But 1. he proveth that they were all of that mind, by citing four of their Books againſt Browniſts; and were four or forty times four, all? But Mr. *Rathbands* is ſaid to be the *Nonconformiſts*. Doth he believe that he meant that all or the twentieth part of the Nonconformiſts wrote or ſubſcribed it? One of the Names to it is Mr. *Simeon Aſh*, my intimate dear friend, whoſe judgment in theſe matters was the ſame with mine, whom I was with even in his ſickneſs almoſt to the laſt hour of his life, and was buryed *Aug.* 23. 1662. the day before the Law had elſe ſilenced him; and he was to me a better Expoſitor of his own mind, than the Dr. can be: He was ſo much for going on to preach, that his Motto in his Funeral Ring was, [*I am not aſhamed of the Goſpel of Chriſt:*] I yet keep my Ring, and can ſhew it you.

And as to old Mr. *Langley*, another of them, I heard him my ſelf preach in *Albriton* Church in *Shropſhire*, a Thankſgiving Sermon for the hopes of deliverance from the ſilencing Biſhops, when the Law forbad him: And for old Mr. *Slater*, I heard him preach at *Trinity* Church in *Coventry* when the Law forbad him: And did they not underſtand their own Writings better than the Dr. doth?

Sect. 23. And I would I knew how to prevail with him to tell me, whether the Law and Canon did not forbid all the Miniſters in *England* to worſhip God according to the Directory, and neglect the Common Prayer Book, which yet almoſt all did for many years in the times of uſurpation: And yet of nine thouſand or more of theſe, ſeven thouſand ſince conformed to the Church of *England*, and they ſay that this Dr. is one of them. If mere diſobedience then be the ſin, all theſe lived ſo long in ſin, and he with others.

Sect. 24. But all that can be gathered out of the four Books [illegible] and ſuch others is but this, which is our judgment: 1. That Churches and Paſtors are under the Kings Government as well as other Subjects. 2. That it belongeth to him to puniſh them for evil doing, and encourage them in doing well. 3. That as to this his own execution, he is the publick Judge whether they do well or ill. 4. That if he juſtly forbid any to preach or aſſemble he muſt be obeyed. 5. And if he miſtake in particular caſes, not deſtroying the ends of his Government, the common good, he muſt not be reſiſted, nor in ſuch a manner diſobeyed, as tendeth more to the common

hurt

hurt than his miſtake doth; nor diſabled to Govern by their diſhonouring him, much leſs by Rebellion or Confuſion. 6. Nor are men bound to caſt away their great advantages for Gods ſervice which they then had, on pretence of *doing better*, when by accident it would do more hurt than good, nor as *Bradſhaw* ſaith, to run on the Sword, or oppoſe Sword to Sword, or raiſe Sedition, and ruin themſelves in vain.

Their advantages were many: 1. Lawful Communion in the Pariſh Churches. 2. Moſt of them either conſtantly or by fits, had publick Churches or Chappels to preach in, and were ſtill in hope. 3. The Magiſtrate protected them and the Reformation. 4. They hoped for a progreſs of it, whereas had they openly done as the Browniſts, they had endangered the Reformation by the exaſperation, and ruined themſelves, and loſt moſt of their labour: So that it is plain that preaching in that imprudent manner which is like to do more harm than good, they took to be a double ſin, as *hurtful* and as *diſobedience*; for obedience is due in ſuch a caſe. But in caſe the manner and circumſtances be ſuch as that theſe evils are not conſequent, but more good than hurt to be expected; they thought the bare breach of the Law no ſin.

Sect. 25. Which I yet further prove, 1. Becauſe its agreed by all, that Governing Order is a *medium* for the thing ordered; and never obligeth when it overthroweth the end, power being given to Edification and not to Deſtruction: None have power to forbid the neceſſary preaching of the Goſpel, and probably to damn Souls. 2. Becauſe elſe the Nonconformiſts ſhould be more againſt preaching when forbidden than the Conformiſts; who ſay as Biſhop *Bilſon*, *We muſt go on with our work, & ſuffer:* and as Biſhop *Andrews Tortur. Torti. Cohibeat Regem Diaconus, &c.* 3. Yea, the Papiſts who on pretence of Obedience are tyrannical, yet moſtly agree (as I have elſewhere proved) that humane Laws bind not beyond the caſe of ſcandal, when they are againſt the common good: And a *Toletane* Council decreed, that their Conſtitutions ſhould not be taken to bind *ad peccatum*, (to hazard Souls) but only *ad pœnam*. 4. As I have ſaid, their own practice fully expounded their words, who conſtantly broke the Law and Canon in preaching in Houſes and in Chappels without, or contrary to the Liturgy, or a part of it. So did Mr. *Ball* at *Whitemore*, Mr. *Hind* at *Banbury*, Mr. *Geree* and Mr. *Fox* at *Tewkſbury*, *John Rogers* at *Dedham*, Mr. *Taylor*, Mr. *Harvy*, Mr. *Bourne* at *Mancheſter*, Mr. *Gee*, Mr. *Johnſon*, Mr. *Hancock*, Mr. *Barlow*, Mr. *Broxholme*, Mr. *Cooper*, and abundance more, beſides thoſe mentioned before.

And now I leave it to the Dr.'s further thoughts, whether he ſpake truly of the ſence of *All the Nonconformiſts*, and have proved what he undertook.

took. To abuſe the Magiſtrate, or do his part for publick Reformation, they were againſt, and ſo are we.

Sect. 26. As to his queſtion, *Was there leſs neceſſity then or now?* I anſwer, 1. There was then more neceſſity as there is of you or me in *America*, where we cannot preach; the people, lately Papiſts, deſired not their helps, nor ſcrupled hearing others, as many thouſands do now. 2. There was *neceſſity* then and ſo there is now, but *opportunity* muſt joyn with neceſſity to oblige, which they had more than we by connivence in Chappels, where was neceſſity, and they had leſs than we in other places.

Sect. 27. As to the Anſwers of Mr. *Sprint*, on my knowledge the uſual anſwer was, That evil muſt not be done that we may have leave to do good, and that if others hinder me becauſe I will not ſin, it is not my omiſſion of any duty; yet the diſparity of the Apoſtles caſe and ours, may be mentioned to ſhew the difference of obligations.

Poſitive Precepts bind not *ad ſemper*, but *Negatives* do; and its too groſs a ſhift to turn a *Negative* to a *Poſitive*, and then pretend that the compariſon is between two duties: preaching is a duty when we can do it, but not when we cannot do it, unleſs we will ſwear, ſubſcribe, profeſs, or practiſe a forbidden thing.

Sect. 28. I conjecture that to what I have proved of the practice of the Nonconformiſts, it will be ſaid that *Their preaching in peculiar places, Chappels, or Churches, though in a manner againſt Law and Canon, was but a partial joyning with the Church of* England, *and not a ſeparation; and the connivence of the Biſhops was a kind of Toleration.*

Anſw. 1. And is not my caſe the ſame? We had more than connivence when we had the Kings Licenſes, and ever ſince experience tells you that his Clemency hath occaſioned a reſtraint of the Biſhops, and ſome connivence from them. 2. And if it were the Temples that make the difference, let them allow us to preach there and ſee whether we will refuſe it: And ſure the Conformiſts that preach in Tabernacles are not Separatiſts; the Pariſh Teacher of St. *Martins* now preacheth in the ſame place which I built to have preached in, and for ſo doing was by a warrant judged to priſon. They had no more Law on their ſide than I have, they uſually read no more of the Liturgy but the Confeſſion and the Scriptures, and many not the firſt at all, and ſome more; ſo that its a full proof that if *breaking the Law had been all their ſtop*, they would have ſtill preached.

Sect. 29. Dr. *Amer* tells us that he had preached without the Biſhops conſent by this Story, *freſh Suit*, p. 409. deſcribing an Engliſh Biſhops Paſtoral work, he ſaith. "It would be ridiculous for a mean man to deſire him "to viſit him, his Wife, or Children, in ſickneſs; he muſt have a Chaplain

"not

"not only to do other duties of Religion for him, but even to give thanks "at his Table. I will not here ſpeak of [*draw up an Excommunication for "him, take him Purſuivant, Jaylor ſee to your Priſoner*;] but note one ex- "ample of mine own experience, which many others can parallel: I was "once (and but once I thank God) before a Biſhop, and being preſented "to him by the chief Magiſtrates of a Corporation, to be Preacher in their "Town; the lowly man firſt asked them, how they durſt chooſe a Preach- "er without his conſent: You (ſaid he) are to receive a Preacher that I "appoint you, for I am your Paſtor, though he never fed them: And then "turning to me, [How durſt you, ſaid he, Preach in my Dioceſs with- "out my leave?] So that without any other reaſon but meer Lordſhip, "the whole Corporation and I were diſmiſſed to wait his leiſure, which I "have done now twenty years and more.

Much like the uſage of holy *Paul Bayne*, Succeſſor to *Perkins*, who being commanded to preach a Viſitation Sermon, and being ſickly and in a ſweat with preaching, was fain to refreſh himſelf inſtead of going preſently to attend the Biſhop; and when he was ſent for, having ſmall Cuffs edged with a little blew thred, ſaith the Biſhop: *How dare you appear before me with thoſe?* and he ſuſpended him: And good Mr. *Bayne* would never more have to do with a Biſhop, but ſaid, *They are an earthly Generation, and ſavour not the things of God.*

When Dr. *Fulke* (a half Conformiſt) went out of St. *Johns* Colledge in *Cambridge* with his Pupils, *hiring Chambers for himſelf and them in the Town*, it was as great a ſeparation from the Colledge (to avoid the Surplice which he after ſubmitted to) as we make from the Church. See *Ames freſh ſuit*, p. 473. And that it was no conſcience of obeying the Biſhop, that *Beza* would have the Miniſters moved by, from aſſembling: Judge by theſe words, [*De notis Eccleſ. Ego pontificiis*—] "I willingly leave to the "Papiſts the whole degree of Epiſcopacy, of which I openly ſay, the "Holy Ghoſt was not the Author, but humane prudence; which if we "obſerve not that God hath curſed, certainly we even yet ſee nothing; "and we nouriſh a viper in our boſoms, which will again kill the Mother.

Sect. 30. I will conclude with the recital of the Letter ſent to the Biſhops by Dr. *Humphrey*, *Regius* Profeſſor in *Oxford*, who yet conſtrained, uſed the Surplice after that: Our Dr. may note what ſence they had then of theſe things, premiſing only the words of *John Fox*, ſpeaking of *Blumfield* a wicked Perſecutor, who threatned a godly man, *Simon Havelſon*, for not wearing the Surplice: [*Its pity*, ſaith he, *ſuch baits of Popery are left to the enemies to take Chriſtians in*; *God take them away from us, or us from them: for God knoweth they be the cauſe of much blindneſs and ſtrife among men.*

Dr.

Dr. Humphrey's Letter to the Bishops.

"*Your Lordships Letter*, directed unto us by our Vice-Chancellor, al-
"though written in general words, yet hath so hearted our Adver-
"saries, that we are now no more counted Brethren and Friends but Ene-
"mies; and sith the old Mass attires be so straitly commanded, the Mass
"it self is shortly looked for. A Sword now is put into the enemies hands
"of these that under Q. *Mary* have drawn it for Popery, and under pretence
"of good order, are ready without cause to bewreck their Popish anger
"upon us, who in this will use extremity, in other laws of more impor-
"tance, partiality. I would have wished, my Lords, rather privy admonition
"than open expulsion; yea I had rather have received wounds of my Bro-
"ther, than kisses of mine Enemy; if we had privily in a convenient day re-
"signed, then neither should the punisher have been noted of cruelty,
"neither the offender of temerity, neither should the Papists have accused
"(in their seditious Book) Protestants of contention. Religion requireth
"naked Christ to be preached, professed, glorified; that *graviora legis*, by
"the faithful Ministry of feeding Pastors, should be furthered, and after
"that orders tending to edification, and not to destruction, advanced; and
"finally the Spouses friends should by all means be cherished, favoured,
"and defended, and not by counterfeit and false intruders, condemned
"and overborn, and defaced. But alas, a man qualified with inward gifts
"for lack of outward shews is punished, and a man only outwardly confor-
"mable and inwardly clean unfurnished, is let alone, yea exalted: The
"painful Preacher for his labour is beaten, the unpreaching Prelate offend-
"ing in the greater, is shotfree; the learned man without his cap is afflict-
"ed, the capped man without learning is not touched: Is not this direct-
"ly to break Gods laws? Is not this the Pharises *vae?* Is not this to wash
"the outside of the Cup, and leave the inner part uncleansed? Is not this to
"prefer Mint and Annis to faith and judgment and mercy? Mans tradition
"before the ordinance of God? Is not this in the School of Christ, and in
"the method of the Gospel a plain disorder? hath not this preposterous
"order a woe? That the Catechism should be read is the word of God,
"it is the order of the Church, to preach is a necessary point of a Priest, to
"make quarterly Sermons is law, to see poor men of the poor mens box re-
"lieved, Vagabonds punished, Parishes communicate, Rood lofts pull'd
"down, Monuments of Superstition defaced, Service done and heard, is Scri-
"pture, is Statute; that the Oath to the Q. Majesty should be offered and

taken,

"taken, is required as well by ordinance of God as of man. Theſe are plain
"matters, neceſſary, Chriſtian, and profitable. To wear a Surplice, a Coap,
"or a corner'd Cap is (as you take it) an accidental thing, a device only
"of man, and as we ſay a doubt or queſtion in divinity. Sith now theſe ſub-
"ſtantial points are in all places of this Realm almoſt neglected, the offen-
"der either nothing or little rebuked, and ſith the tranſgreſſors have no
"colour of conſcience, it is ſin and ſhame to proceed againſt us firſt, having
"alſo reaſonable defence of our doings: Charity my Lords, would firſt have
"taught us, Equity would firſt have ſpared us, brotherlineſs would have war-
"ned us, pity would have pardoned us, if we had been found treſpaſſers.
"God is my witneſs, who is the beholder of all faith, I think of your Lord-
"ſhips honourably, eſteeming you as brethren, reverencing you as Lords and
"Maſters of the Congregation: alas why have not you ſome good opinion
"of us? why do you truſt known Adverſaries and miſtruſt your Brethren?
"We confeſs one faith of Jeſus, we preach one doctrine, we acknowledg one
"Ruler upon earth, in all things (ſaving in this) we are of your judgment,
"ſhall we be uſed thus for a Surplice? ſhall brethren perſecute brethren
"for a forked Cap, deviſed ſingularity of him that is our enemy? Now ſhall
"we fight for the Popes coat, his head and body being baniſhed? ſhall the
"controverſie ſo fall out in concluſion. that for lack of neceſſary furniture
"(as it is eſteemed) labourers ſhall lack wages? Churches preaching? ſhall
"we not teach? ſhall we not exerciſe our Talents as God hath commanded
"us, becauſe we will not wear that which our enemies have deſired, and that
"by the appointment of Friends. Oh that ever I ſaw this day that our Adver-
"ſaries ſhould laugh to ſee brethren fall together by the ears: Oh that *Ephra-*
"*im* ſhould thus eat up *Manaſſes*, *Manaſſes Ephraim*. My Lords, before this
"take place, conſider the cauſe of the Church, the Creſts and triumphs of An-
"tichriſt, the laughter of *Satan*, the ſorrow and ſighs of a number, the miſery
"and ſequel of the Tragedy. I write with zeal without proof of my matter
"at this time preſent, but not without knowledg of it, nor without grief of
"mind: God move your Spirit at this preſent to fight againſt *Carnem*, *Cir-*
"*cumciſionem*, *immo Conciſionem*, againſt *Literam & Legem*, which principally
"is now regarded and rewarded. Speak I humbly beſeech you to the Queens
"Majeſty, to the Chancellor, and to Mr. Secretary and the reſt, that thoſe
"proceedings may ſleep, that *England* may underſtand your zealous mind
"toward the worſhip of God, your love toward the poor welwillers, your
"hate toward the profeſſed enemies, your unity in true conformity, the o-
"ther neither be needful now, neither exacted in any good age: So ſhall the
"little Flock be bound to you, ſo ſhall the great Shepherd be good to you.

Chap

An Answer to the falſe Accuſations and Reaſonings of the Dr.'s Second Part.

HEre the Dr. begins with the deſcription of their principles whom he accuſeth (I am one of them:) And the firſt ſort are thoſe ["that hold partial and occaſional Communion with "our Churches to be lawful, but not total and conſtant,] *viz.* "[at ſome times to be preſent, and in ſome part of our worſhip, and on "particular occaſion to partake of ſome acts of Communion with us; but "they apprehend greater purity and edification in ſeparate Congregati-"ons, and when they are to chooſe they think themſelves bound to chooſe "theſe, though at certain ſeaſons they may think it lawful to ſubmit to "occaſional Communion with our Church.] The ſecond ſort are "Such "as hold any Communion with our Church unlawful: And he pretends to "proceed with all poſſible clearneſs.]

Anſw. I am ſorry if more clearneſs and truth is become *impoſſible* to him. He taketh not me to be one of the ſecond ſort, and therefore deſcribeth me as of the firſt: Its no preſumption to ſay that I know my own mind and practice better than he doth, though he would ſeem to know the old Non-conformiſts minds better than they did themſelves.

Sect. 2. The matter of fact muſt firſt be notified: 1. I ever diſtinguiſhed the National, Dioceſan, Parochial, and Segregate Churches: And the *National* as ſuppoſed organized, or an Eccleſiaſtically political Society, from the National as a Chriſtian Kingdom, and as an *agreeing Aſſociation* of *Churches*, without any Governor of the whole (*Single* or *Ariſtocratical.*) And I diſtinguiſhed Dioceſans that are as Arch-Biſhops over lower Biſhops, and thoſe that are like ours, *infimæ ſpeciei*: and I diſtinguiſhed *Pariſh Churches* that have *true Paſtors*, from thoſe that have none but uncapable men, through inſufficiency, hereſie, malignity, or as uſurpers are not truly called.

2. Accordingly I concluded, 1. That the Pariſh Churches in England that have true Paſtors, are true political governed Churches. 2. That though ſome would make them none, by denying to the Paſtors all eccleſi-

tial part of their office, and make the Biſhop the ſole Paſtor, and the reſt but his Curates, and the Pariſhes no Churches as having no Biſhop, but to be only as Chappels, part of the loweſt governed Church (Dioceſan) and ſo give up the cauſe to the Browniſts called Separatiſts; yet truly ſuch Pariſhes are true political Churches, becauſe the ordainer being but the *inveſting Miniſter*, the office is not eſſentiated as he *willeth* or *ſaith*, but as God the Inſtituter *willeth and ſaith*. As the power of the *Huſband* over the *Wife* is not what pleaſe the Prieſt that marryeth them, but what pleaſeth God who giveth it by his Law; and as the Lord Mayor's power is not what pleaſe the Recorder, or he that giveth him his Oath or *Inſignia*, but what the Kings *Charter* giveth; and the Kings power is not what he will that Crowneth him and giveth him his Oath, but what he hath right to by the conſtitution of the Kingdom; ſo that the truth of the Pariſh Churches is ſoundly maintained by the Nonconformiſts, and overthrown by many of the Dioceſans: But if the Pariſh Miniſter himſelf conſent not to the eſſentials of his own office, his Miniſtry may be valid to others while he is in the place, but he is, himſelf, no true Paſtor.

3. All Pariſhes are no true governed Churches, whoſe Miniſters want any thing eſſential to a Paſtor, nor muſt be owned as ſuch if known.

4. But for the peoples ſake they are true Churches, *ſecundum quid*, or equivocally as a company of Chriſtians may be ſo called that have no Paſtor, and as ſuch may be ſo far communicated with.

5. I never ſpake againſt a Dioceſan or Arch-Biſhop, that hath Pariſh Churches, and true Paſtors or Biſhops under him, and taketh on him no more than the Apoſtles, did, excepting their work, properly Apoſtolical, *viz.* by the Word and not the Sword, to overſee and inſtruct inferior Paſtors.

6. When the Dioceſans put down all lower Churches and true Paſtors, I own not that doing, nor them in that form; but I ſeparate from them no further than they do from Chriſt.

7. When they are but as good Arch-Biſhops taking care of many Churches, whether their Dioceſs ſhall be called a *Church* as ſuch, is but *lis de nomine*. I find not that any Apoſtle as ſuch, was the conſtitutive Head of a Dioceſan or Provincial Church, or made any ſuch, above particular Churches: Nor do I find in the New Teſtament any political Church form, but the Univerſal headed by Chriſt, and particular ones governed by Paſtors. The General is the conſtitutive Head of his Army, and the Colonel of his Regiment, and the Captain of his Troop, as diſtinct ſubordinate Bodies; but the Major General, General of the Ordnance, Quartermaſter General, &c. may be only under-Officers to the whole, and the nobleſt integral

tegral parts, but as ſuch no conſtitutive Head of any Body of Men whatever: So that General Paſtors prove no ſuperiot proper Church. But becauſe it was lawful in prudence for the Apoſtles to have taken ſeveral Provinces, limited ſeverally to each, ſo may men now; and if any call ſuch Churches, I ſtrive not, ſo the matter be agreed on.

8. I ever owned a *Chriſtian Kingdom*, and the agreeing Aſſociation of as many Churches as can for mutual help and concord, and the King to be their Governor by the Sword: And if any will call a Kingdom a Church, or an Aſſociation that hath no conſtitutive Government, a Church; as if he called a Diet or Aſſembly of many Kings or Princes, a Kingdom or Republick, let him enjoy his Equivocation, ſo we underſtand each other.

9. According to theſe Principles I own my ſelf a Member of the univerſal Church, of the Church of *England*, and of the Pariſh or particular Church where for the time I am called to be; that is, as they are. But I think I may remove from Pariſh to Pariſh as I have cauſe, as a dweller or a lodger may; and I take not all the Pariſh to be the Church, and take Pariſh bounds to be no Divine Inſtitution, but a humane mutable point of order, convenient when by accident it croſſeth not the end, nor doth more harm than good.

10. I think if any Nobleman in *London* confine his ordinary communion to a juſt aſſembly in his Chappel, or any that have a Miniſter utterly unſuitable to their needs, do uſually hold communion in the next Pariſh Church for better, he is thereby neither Separatiſt nor Sinner.

11. According to all this, when I was ſilenced I ordinarily heard Dr. *Wilkins* and Dr. *Tillotſon*; and communicated in ſeveral places as I had beſt opportunity; and quickly going to *Acton*, I there conſtantly morning and evening joyned at Common prayer and Sermon, communicating in the Sacrament where I had beſt opportunity, (being loth for the Parſon and Curates ſake, to tell you why it was not there,) once with Dr. *Horton* and often with Nonconformiſts. The Plague driving me to *Hambden*, I conſtantly there joyned in all the publick Worſhip and Sacrament: Returning to *Acton*, I did as before, and ſometime repeated Dean *Rieve*'s Sermon, till he got me ſent to Gaol for teaching ſome willing ignorant people between the Church meetings in my houſe: Thence going to *Totteridge*, I many years conſtantly twice a day joyned in the publick worſhip, and took the Sacrament when adminiſtred as Mr. *Parre* will teſtifie. Thence removing to *London*, and licenſed by the King to preach, I forbare ſome time, and after choſe only the Market houſe at St. *James*'s, openly declaring that we met not as ſeparating from the publick Churches, but for the need of multitudes that went to no Church for want of room. Since then I have many years joyned in all the publick worſhip, Word, Prayer, and Sacraments,

with

with the Parish Church, when able, since that I also sometime joyn with Nonconformists, and preach my self Afternoons, and on Thursdays in the Nonconformists Chappels, being not allowed to do it otherwise. In the Country in Summer, I have far off got into some Parish Churches for a day, and tryed neer *London*, but could not have consent, though I have Bishop *Sheldon*'s License for that Dioces, I think not yet invalidated. This is the matter of fact.

Now Reader, *Qu.* 1. Doth the tenth part of those counted of this Parish Church, hear and communicate so oft as I do.

Q. 2. If not, what makes them and not me to be of that Church?

Q. 3. What is the constancy that this Dr. maketh necessary to a member?

Q. 4. What are the parts of their worship which he saith I joyn not in? Hath he named any?

Q. 5. Is this only occasional joyning?

Sect. 3. I do maintain that 1. When, *consideratis considerandis*, we may choose the *purest Churches and most edifying Ministry*, it is a duty so to do. And one of his answers (*the Rector, &c.*) hath in the Epistle cited his own words, not out of the retracted *Irenicon*, but his late Book against Popery, expresly threatning us with *damnation* if we do not. To which I find no excuse made by him, yea the Papist adversary grants the same.

2. I do maintain against those that separate from all Churches which they dare not be stated members of, that its lawful to communicate occasionally, where we may not do it statedly: But is this to deny all save occasional communion with all their Churches?

3. I often say that there is so great difference of Parish Ministers, and of Persons cases and opportunities, and Relations, (as Wives, Children, Servants, under Parents, *&c.* of divers commands, &c.) that to be constant Communicants in their Parish Church, is to some a duty, to some a sin, and so is occasional communion.

Sect. 4. As to the second sort, *that hold all communion with them unlawful.* 1. I leave them to plead their own cause, and I meddle only with my own part. 2. But I must say that if they mistake, those that wilfully give them the occasion are unfit reprovers of them: And if men for worldly ends or by error, will corrupt and defile a Church to the utmost that is consistent with lawful Communion (or neer it) they may make the question *whether their Communion be lawful*, too hard for understandings. Every one cannot tell whether one in a swoon be alive or dead, and some may bury him too hastily.

Stretch not my similitude beyond my meaning: If a Gentleman of the game should by wilful sin, get the *Lues Venerea*, and the case be disputed whether his wife may separate from him, or if he beat her once a week, if she

ſhe will not daily eat that which makes her grievous ſick, and he doth it to exerciſe his Authority, another may better plead againſt her departure than he: If it be a fault in her ſo to ſave her ſelf, what is it in him to deſtroy or abuſe her?

If we be forbidden to take poyſon, and one will cauſeleſly command us to take a doubtful thing, as Nightſhade, Hemlock, *Auripigmentum*, &c. and then condemn us as diſobedient for refuſing, he is the unfitteſt perſon to condemn us. If it be lawful to avoid a houſe that hath the Plague, a man is excuſable that miſtakes the ſpotted Fever for it.

Were your Congregations but full of perſons that had the ſcabs of the ſmall Pox not dryed away, and one went to a ſounder Congregation for fear of infection, not at all condemning you, he might be born with. If in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeths* Reign, when abundance of Papiſt Prieſts ſtaid in the Churches for their Benefices, a man had quietly gone from them to the Nonconformiſts, I could not blame him; though he had not been ſure that they were not changed.

And I ſtill ſay that if ſuch erre by too much care to avoid ſin and ſave their ſouls, 1. It is a far greater error to give them the occaſion. 2. And in ſuch as you to ſay, that therefore they muſt be ſo far forſaken, as that none may preach to them. If I may preach to no erring people, 1. I muſt preach to none. 2. Or be no Phyſician to any that are ſick.

And I muſt ſay, that though I found no call to gather any together as a Church, and give them the Sacrament; I cannot ſay that no other had ſuch, unleſs I had heard them all ſpeak for themſelves: yea I ſee ſuch notorious need in many places, that I dare not blame them.

Sect. 5. And now Reader, *Qu.* whether the Dr. hath truly ſtated the caſe between him and me; and whether you can expect truth and edification in his handling of a falſe-ſtated caſe.

Theſe are the queſtions which, as my accuſer, (in his Book) he ſhould have handled, had truth been his deſign. 1. "Whether for one that "holdeth ſo much Communion with their Churches as I have done, and "here deſcribe, it be ſinful ſeparation to Preach in and Communicate "with the Aſſemblies of Nonconformiſts, or mixt ones, as I have done? "2. Whether to deny this to be ſinful Separation (*or* Separation *as commonly taken for Schiſm*) be diſingenious, and worſe than theirs that openly renounce their Communion.

Sect. 6. Three things he ſaith, *p.* 94. we cannot deny, 1. *That there is no reaſon of Separation becauſe of the Doctrine of their Church.*

Anſw. 1. We diſtinguiſh of Separation: There is no reaſon to ſeparate from you as no Church, or further than we do; there is reaſon to deny

deny our conſent, 1. To your foreſaid Doctrine of all baptized dying Infants undoubted ſalvation, not excepting thoſe of Atheiſts and Infidels. 2. To your included Doctrine implyed in your Impoſitions, *viz.* "That if a man "have unlawfully made a Vow and Oath to endeavour in his Place and Cal-"ling to reform ſome corruptions in Church-Government, yea or to re-"pent of his ſin and oppoſe Popery, Prophaneneſs, and Schiſm; there is "no obligation on him from that Oath and Vow to do it. Theſe and ſuch other Doctrines we ſeparate from, ſo far as to reject them.

Sect. 7. His ſecond ſuppoſed Conceſſion is, [*That there is no other reaſon of Separation becauſe of the terms of our Communion, than what was from the beginning of the Reformation.*

Anſw. 1. There are in my judgment no common reaſons for going further from you than we do, nor to juſtifie that which is commonly known by the name of Separation. But there are many and great reaſons to juſtifie our meaſure of diſſent and miniſtration; and to ſay that [*we grant there are no more reaſons now than were then,*] is too bold an untruth. There is more reaſon, 1. From the quality of the things impoſed. 2. From the deſigns and drift of the Impoſition. 3. From the effects. 4. From the aggravation of Conformity as in the Church that we muſt communicate with. 5. From the things which give us a fuller cauſe for our Preaching and Aſſemblies. *viz.* 1. The late general contrary Church State and Engagement to it. 2. The Plague. 3. The burning of the Churches. 4. The Kings Licenſe and Clemency. 5. The number and quality of them that ſeek our helps. Of theſe briefly in order.

1. As to the things impoſed now which were not then.

1. The Veſtry Act was not then made, by which ſo conſiderable a part of your Pariſh Churches as the Veſtries, are to renounce all obligations to endeavour any alteration of the Government of the Church, from the Oath and Vow called the Covenant: So that all Reformation of Church Government as ſo ſworn, was thus renounced by them who in a ſort repreſent the Pariſh Church.

2. The Act of Uniformity had not then impoſed the ſame declarative Renunciation of all ſuch obligation on all the Miniſters and Schoolmaſters in *England*, as it now doth.

3. The Corporation Act was not then in being, which conſtituteth all the Officers in power in all Cities and Corporations, of ſuch only as declare, [*that there is no obligation from the ſaid Oath at all,*] not excepting ſo much as the ſworn duties of oppoſing Popery, Prophaneneſs, and Schiſm, *to repent of ſin and amend our lives.* And if *ſwearing and vowing againſt Schiſm*, no whit bind men (if the Oath were but unlawfully impoſed,

ſted, why ſhould the Dr. make ſo great a matter of it, and think that his reaſonings ſhould make men afraid of Gods ſervice, if he will but call it Schiſm.

4. None of theſe Acts then required men to profeſs and ſubſcribe, that there is from that Vow or Oath no ſuch Obligation on *any* other perſon; and ſo to become Vouchers for the Souls and Conſciences of many hundred thouſands whom we never ſaw; even thoſe Parliament men that were not forced to it, but impoſed it on others, when we know not in what ſenſe they took it.

5. The Re-ordination of Miniſters ordained by Presbyteries was not then required, and made a neceſſary condition of their Miniſtration and Church Relation, (even by them that confeſs Re-ordination unlawful, and therefore plainly intimate the nullity of the firſt.)

6. The Act of Uniformity was not then made, which requireth all Miniſters publickly to declare their *Aſſent and Conſent to all things contained in, and preſcribed by the Liturgy, Book of Ordination*, (though part of this was in a Canon.)

7. The falſe Rule for finding *Eaſter-day* was not then to be aſſented and conſented to, as a conditlon of the Miniſtry.

8. Nor the new Doctrine or Article of Faith, [*of the undoubted certainty by Gods word, that baptized dying Infants are ſaved,*] (without any exception of the children of Atheiſts, *&c.*) For the old words at Confirmation (as many Drs. of the Church have ſhewed) only meant that nothing elſe was neceſſary on the Churches part, that is, not Confirmation.

9. The word [*Paſtor*] as applyed to Pariſh Miniſters diſtinct from Curates, was not then blotted out of moſt places in the Liturgy; nor the twentieth of *Acts*, as applied to Presbyters, left out, (*Take heed to your ſelves and the Flock, &c.*) in plain deſign to alter the Office and Pariſh Churches.

10. The *Oxford* Oath was not then impoſed, to baniſh Miniſters above five miles from all Cities, and Corporations, and Places, where they had of late years preached; ſo that their old Flock or Friends (yea, Wives and Children that could not follow them) might not ſo much as ſee or hear ſuch Miniſters in their Families, or familiar converſe that would have come to the publick Churches: And all Nonconformiſt Miniſters that took not the Oath, were thereby forbidden to come to the Pariſh Churches in all Cities, Corporations, or Places aforeſaid, though their example might have drawn many (as mine did where I was.)

11. Miniſters and Corporations and Veſtries, were not then bound to ſwear or ſubſcribe, that it is *unlawful on any pretence whatſoever to reſiſt any commiſſioned by the King*; when the Keeper of his Seal may ſign Commiſſions to ſeize on the Kings Forts, Garriſons, Navies, and Treaſuries, to deliver up the Kingdoms to Foreigners, to deſtroy Parliaments, Cities, and Laws: I am ſure *Hooker*, *Bilſon*, or Arch-Biſhop *Abbot*, ſubſcribed not this, nor were ſuch Conformiſts. Are all theſe no difference of caſe?

Self. 8. There is 2. a great difference in the drift and tendency of the Impoſitions. They were at firſt to quiet a Popiſh Nation, while the true Doctrine took poſſeſſion and rooting, and to avoid the cavils of thoſe Papiſts that charged the Reformers with forſaking all the Church: But what they have been uſed for theſe laſt forty or fifty years, I leave the Reader to judge.

1. By the Complaints of all the Parliaments, ſince then, ſave one.
2. By the Hiſtory of Arch-Biſhop *Laud*'s Tryal.
3. By Dr. *Heylin*'s Hiſtory of his Life.
4. By the writings of Divines, ſuch as Mr. *Thorndike*, Dr. *Parker*, Dr. *Pierce*, Arch-Biſhop *Bramhall*, and many more ſuch; and by the Papiſts hiſtorical collection out of ſuch.

See Dr. *Heylin*'s deſcription of the Reconciling Plot, *Anno* 1639.

Arch-Biſhop *Bramhal* ſaith, *Vindicat. p.* 19. *&c.* "[*Whereas* Mr. Baxter "*doth accuſe* Grotius *as a Papiſt, I think he doth him wrong, nay I am confident* "*he doth him wrong.*—And I have read all that he alledgeth to prove it, but "without any conviction or alteration in my judgment.——I will endea- "vour to give ſome further light what was the Religion of *Grotius*: He "was in affection a friend, and in deſire a true Son of the Church (*a*) of "*England*: And on his Deathbed recommended that Church, as it was le- "gally eſtabliſhed to his Wife, and ſuch other of his Family as were then "about him, obliging them by his Authority to adhere firmly to it.

The ſaid Biſhop (though no Papiſt) ſaith, *pag.* 81. "(*b*) [I know no "members of the Greek Church, who give them (the Papiſts) either more "or leſs than I do: (Compare this with the Councel at *Florence*, and the "Patriarch *Jeremiah*'s Writings, and the preſent ſence of the Greek

(*a*) *The new Church ſince* Biſhop Laud's *change.* (*b*) *Note that the* Biſhops Book *as againſt me, runs upon a mere fiction, p.* 76. *that I traduce him as a Factor for Popery, when I had not a word to that purpoſe; yea expreſly excepted him by name, though I argued againſt his too neer approach.*

"Church

"Church, and we may know his mind:) But my ground is not the au-
"thority of the Greek Church, but the authority of the Primitive Fathers,
"and General Councils, which are the representative Body of the Uni-
"verſal Church. (c) P. 82. [To wave their laſt four hundred years
"determinations, is implicitly to renounce all the neceſſary cauſes of
"this great Schiſm. (d) And to reſt ſatisfied with their old Patriarchal
"power and dignity, and Primacy of Order, (which is another part of
"my Propoſition) is to quit the modern Papacy, name and thing. (e)

"Pag. 84, 85. [That Chriſtians may joyn together in the ſame pub-
"lick devotions and ſervice of Chriſt,——1. If the Biſhop of *Rome*
"were reduced from the Univerſality of Soveraign Juriſdiction, *jure di-*
"*vino*, to his *principium unitatis*, and his Court regulated by the Canons
"of the Fathers, which was the ſence of the Councils of *Conſtance* and
"*Baſil*, and is deſired by many Roman Catholicks, as well as we. 2. If
"the Creed were reduced to what they were in the time of the four firſt
"General Councils, with only neceſſary explications, and thoſe made
"by the Authority of a General Council. 3. And ſome things whence
"offences have been given or taken, be put out of the Divine Offices——
"Whether Chriſtians ought not to live in holy Communion, and come
"to the ſame publick worſhip of God, free from all ſchiſmatical ſepa-
"rations. (f)

"Pag. 93. 1. That St. *Peter* had a fixed Chair at *Antioch*, and after at
"*Rome*, is a truth.——2. That St. *Peter* had a Primacy of Order among
"the Apoſtles, is the unanimous voice of the Primitive Church.——
"3. Some Fathers and Schoolmen who were no ſworn Vaſſals to the Roman
"Biſhop, do affirm that this Primacy of Order is fixed to the Chair of
"St. *Peter*.

"P. 97. Though the Biſhop of *Rome* had ſuch a Primacy of Order by
"Divine Right or Humane, it would not prejudice us at all, nor is worth
"the contending about. But, 1. It is not by Divine Right in *foro exteriore*.
"2. Nor elſewhere (*interiore*) but executive according to the Canons. (g)

(c) *No ſuch thing, but of the Churches within the Empire then.* (d) *was there no neceſſary cauſe till after, An.* 1200? (e) *So then theſe Proteſtant Biſhops give the Pope Patriarchal Power, and Primacy of Order, and as much as the Greeks: But* 1. *They had by Councils of old no Patriarchal Power over other Kingdoms out of the Empire.* 2. *Obedience to the Pope as a Patriarch, is againſt the Oath of Supremacy, and in the matter little diffareth our caſe from obeying him as Pope.* (f) *So that this Arch-Biſhop alſo was fit on the pious deſign of joyning with the Papiſts on theſe terms, and may not we have leave to worſhip God on better terms?* (g) *That is,* 1. *The Pope is not to govern us arbitrarily, but by Canons, (which what they are is hardly known.)* 2. *And all will be Schiſmaticks, that ſo obey him not.*

Whereas I ſaid that Proteſtants that conſent not to the Popes Patriarchal Power over us in the Weſt, will fall under the reproach of Schiſm; he ſaith, *p.* 104. *&c.* [Muſt a man quit his juſt right becauſe ſome diſlike it? Their diſlike is but ſcandal taken, but the quitting of that which is right for their ſatisfaction, ſhould be ſcandal given. *(h)* If they be forced to fall under the reproach of Schiſmaticks, it is by their own wilful humors, or erroneous Conſcience, other force there is none. 2. Whether is the worſe and more dangerous condition, to fall under the reproach of Schiſm, or to fall into Schiſm it ſelf? Whoſoever ſhall oppoſe the juſt power of a lawful Patriarch lawfully proceeding, is a material Schiſmatick at leaſt.— *P.* 107. It's unſound arguing to deny a man his juſt right for fear leſt he may abuſe it, as a Patriarchal Power was the Biſhop of *Rome*'s juſt right. They who made the Biſhop of *Rome* a Patriarch were the Primitive Fathers, not excluding the Apoſtles and Chriſtian Emperors and Oecumenical Councils: what Laws they made in this caſe we are bound to obey for Conſcience ſake, till lawfully repealed by vertue of the Law of Chriſt. *(i)*

Much more he hath to this purpoſe, and *p.* 112. for uniting the Church Catholick on humane terms, and *p.* 117. againſt the peoples liberty of reading and interpreting Scripture; and after at large that concord muſt be on humane terms, *p.* 122. [*Grotius* judgment was, and *mine* is *moderate*,] but had not this man been ſo owned by many now, I had not cited ſo much of his. And for *Grotius*, I have over and over cited his own words, and ſhall not now repeat them: And was this the drift of Conformity of old?

3. *Sect.* 9. Another difference is in the effects; for with us, things not univerſally or abſolutely determined by God, are to be uſed or refuſed as they do more good or hurt. 1. Then open Preaching and gathering Aſſemblies by Nonconformiſts, would have greatly offended the Prince; but our King at *Breda*, and in his three firſt Declarations, and by his Licenſes, and connivence, ſhewed ſuch wiſdom and clemency, as intimated

---

(h) 1. *Thus for union with* Rome, *all Proteſtants muſt paſs for ſelf made Schiſmaticks, that cannot obey the Pope as Patriarch: And doth this tend indeed to Concord? It would open Proteſtants eyes, did I but tell you all that is in the Canons, which the Pope as our Patriarch muſt rule us by, as thoſe Doctors do deſire.* (i) 1. *If this Doctrine be true, no wonder that* Mr. Thorndike *thought we could not juſtifie our Reformation, till we alter the Oath of Supremacy; then we are bound in conſcience to a Foreign Juriſdiction.* 2. *I have fully proved many great errors and ſins to be decreed by many of the Councils, by which the Pope, as Patriarch, muſt rule us all.* 3. *Is it any eaſier to do evil in obedience to a Patriarch than a Pope?* 4. *In my laſt Book againſt* W. Johnſon, *alias* Tenet, *I have fully confuted all that he ſaith of the univerſality of Councils, and the Patriarchs power over the Abaſſines, and others without the Empire, and ſhewed they were then all but in one Empire, as the Arch-Biſhop of* Canterbury *is in* England.

leſs

leſs diſpleaſure at our liberty. 2. It would have deprived moſt of the Nonconformiſts of their hopes of publick liberty in the Pariſh Churches, which moſt of them enjoyed; but we had neither poſſeſſion nor expectation of ſuch a thing. 3. It would have hindred and hazarded the progreſs of the Reformation, but our preaching hath done more to ſtop the progreſs of the Syncretiſm, or of Popery: Others know this whatever you frivolouſly ſay againſt it. 4. Few of the moſt ignorant that needed them would then have left the Pariſh Churches, to hear Nonconformiſts in private; but now many will come to us that cannot get in to the Pariſh Churches: Other different effects may be named.

Sect. 10. 4. And though I accuſe you not, you that unjuſtly ſaid before that I made you ſeem a *company* of *perjured Villains*, ſeems to think your ſelf that the fore alledged cauſes make many of the people think little better of ſome; and a Church thought to conſiſt of ſuch Paſtors and Veſtries, *&c.* (eſſential parts) differ from thoſe that do not. 2. And the multitude of Atheiſts and filthy livers, and the thouſands of Noncommunicants who are ſtill taken for real members of your Churches, have now ſtood out againſt ſo long means and patience, that the reaſons of longer waiting for Reformation, much differs from theirs in the beginning. 3. The Canon at firſt did not *ipſo facto*, excommunicate all that do but profeſs themſelves Nonconformiſts, as ſince it did. 4. The Biſhops and their Canoneers had not then caſt out 2000, nor neer ſo many Preachers as now, and ſo did not ſo much tempt the people to flee from them as perſecutors, thorns, thiſtles, or wolves. 5. When one Biſhop caſt any out, ſome other uſually would endure them, but now it was not ſo. 6. The people ſaw daily, that you bore with thoſe as no Schiſmaticks, that never communicated nor *uſed* to hear you, even the greater half of many Pariſhes, and took them for Church members as is ſaid; and therefore they had reaſon to hope that they that communicated ſomewhere with Proteſtants, eſpecially that communicated alſo with your own Churches, were as good Members, and by good Paſtors, would be as well endured.

Sect. 11. 5. Laſtly, The forenamed cauſes of our preaching much differ. 1. We ſaw the Kingdom (though under uſurpers) engaged by Vow, Practice, and about ſixteen years poſſeſſion and cuſtom, to another way; and who could expect that a Law ſhould preſently change them all, and aſſure them of abſolution. 2. They that conformed were the more averſe, to ſee about ſix thouſand Miniſters that had gone the other way, ſo ſuddenly change; as to declare aſſent and conſent to a Book which they never ſaw. 3. The caſe of the Plague, the burning of the Churches, the Kings Licenſes, *&c.* I named before, which verily made a great difference. 4. And the numbers

that

that call to us for help makes a great difference, when then they that needed them moſt, did not deſire it. Theſe are ſome differences.

Sect. 12. *p.* 95. He ſaith, *There is no reaſon of ſeparation becauſe of the doctrine of our Church.*] *Anſw.* But now you have corrupted it, in the Article of Infants undoubted ſalvation before deſcribed, (and before by the doctrines about Prelacy, Godfathers power and duty, Impoſitions, *&c.* implyed in your practical Canons) there is great cauſe of Nonconformity.

P. 96. Repeateth that great miſtake, that [*there are no alterations*, in our own judgment, which make the *terms of Communion harder than before.*] *Anſw.* What hope then of being underſtood? how far is this from truth? The terms are far harder to Miniſters? and to the people they are eaſier in ſome things (as amending ſome tranſlations, *&c.*) but it is not to them a ſmall matter to make ſuch a change of their Paſtors, as in too many Pariſhes is made. The Biſhop promiſed them at *Kiderminſter*, when he forbad me to preach, that they ſhould be no loſers by the change: They ſaid (and I had great reaſon to believe them) that the Succeſſor knew ſo little of the ſence of the Creed, and preach'd ſo rarely (four times a year) I am loth to tell you how, that they durſt not be guilty of encouraging him in undertaking the charge of Souls, nor durſt take him for their Paſtor; And the great increaſe of buildings in *London*, ſhuts thouſands now out of ſuch Pariſh Churches, who could have got in heretofore; and ſome more differences are before implyed. *p.* 97. As other Churches own your Churches, ſo do we, though not your impoſed ſins.

Sect. 13. *p.* I was in hope to have met with ſome anſwer to my importunate Queſtion, [*What would you have the many ſcore thouſands do, that cannot come within your Churches to hear?*] But no importunity will prevail for ſo ſmall a matter with *inexorable men.* But he ſaith, 1. that [*this is but a pretence.*] 2. And that [*no man denyeth that more places are deſirable, &c.*] *Anſ.* 1. It is me that he is now accuſing! why doth he barely ſay and not prove, that it's but a pretence? I never ſet up a Meeting place, but in St. *Martins* Pariſh, where are ſaid to be forty thouſand more than can come within the Church: And when they would not ſuffer me to uſe it, I gladly left it to the uſe of the Pariſh Miniſter. I preach now twice a week elſewhere, but both the places are in Neighbourhoods, where many thouſands cannot hear in the Pariſh Churches. What if other men have other ſufficient reaſons (as the utter incapacity of ſome Miniſters, or the like) doth it follow that my own caſe and profeſſed reaſon is a meer pretence? why then did I uſe no publick preaching, while I lived in ſuch Villages where the people might go to Church? and why did I conſtantly twice a day lead them thither, though ſome diſliked it? 2. The queſtion is not whether *more Church-*

es

et are desirable? But where they are not, whether many thousands must live like Atheists, without all publick teaching or Divine Worship, for fear of being called Schismaticks. Is not this plainly to chuse damnation? If the Gospel be needless, why do we wish the Heathens had it? Why subscribe you against mens hopes of being saved in all their several Religions? If Church worship be needless, why is a Clergy to be so honoured, and maintained at so dear a rate? And why do you make such a stir with Separatists to bring them to your Churches? Can men, not blinded by interest, chuse but wonder, that so many thousands in a Parish should be taken for Church Members, and live quietly, that come not to any Church, or never communicate with any, and yet that godly persons who hear and communicate with their old tryed Pastors (yea with such as communicate with you) should be preach'd and written against as Schismaticks, and judged to that which some endure. Did this Dr. think that to drop in the case of other men, when he was at a loss, would make good his charge against me, and such as I: Mr. *Tombes* and Mr. *Williams* preached other doctrine; do I do so, and have you proved it?

But seeing he will needs bring the case to *Kidderminster*, whether I would suffer Mr. *Tombes* to gather a Congregation, I must not balk it; but advise him hereafter to keep himself at a greater distance, and not to put his own followers, who are willing enough to believe him, upon utter impossibilities: He sped better with them when he laid the scene an hundred years backward, or as far off as *New England*; let him know then all these things in confutation of his historical supposition. 1. That *Kidderminster* Parish hath but about three thousand or four thousand souls, and the Church so fit (with five Galleries) that all may hear: But his Parish is said to have twenty thousand souls, of which not four thousand can hear. 2. A considerable part of *Kidderminster* Parish, called *Ridnal*, being at *Bewdly Bridge* end, and two miles from *Kidderminster*, (and some Villages more) usually were Mr. *Tombes* his hearers at *Bewdley*, and I never blamed them. 3. After him, they were Hearers and Communicants to his Successor Mr. *Oasland*, and he took the Pastoral care of them (that desired any;) and I was so far from blaming him, that I greatly thanked him, and we were far from disagreeing. 4. Though Mr. *Tombes* and I differed in the doctrine of Infant Baptism, I gave him leave (yea and the Quakers too) in the publick Church many hours together, to say all that they could for their opinions in the hearing of my Auditors, and none of them ever won one of them that I heard of, (yet the Dr. supposeth some great danger of their peoples seduction, if they hear such as I that never were accused of false Doctrine. 5. But he hath chosen an instance yet neerer our present case: Another part of *Kider-*

minster

minſter Pariſh is neer three miles off, at a Village called *Mitton*; where at the Chappel I found a Curate called Mr. *Turner*, infamous for drunkenneſs, fighting, living on unlawful marriage, and for groſs ignorance: (I tryed him, and perceived not that he underſtood much of the Creed,) I ſent them a worthy Preacher once a day firſt, and twice after, and declared my utter diſſent to Mr. *Turner*'s Miniſtry; yet becauſe ſome of the Church of *England* would have him, and he would, againſt my will, read the Common Prayer to them once a day, I hindred them not from their choice, but they went on. 6. And the ſequeſtred Vicar in the Town (Mr. *Dance*) was generally taken to be as ignorant as he, ſo that when once a quarter he went into the Pulpit, his own Wife, though of the Church of *England*, would for ſhame go out of Church: Yet did I never forbid him to preach, and he oft read the Common Prayer at Sir *Ralph Clares*, and I ſuppoſe gave them the Sacrament. 7. I had opportunity then to have hindred all this if I would have uſed Magiſtrates: They were both by Proclamation to remove two miles off, but neither of them once removed ſo much as out of their houſes, nor did I deſire it; but we are by law driven five miles off. 8. Mr. *Dance* had forty pounds a year allowed him, and Mr. *Turner* never had a groat of his ancient Salary diminiſhed, when another was put in, but the other paid otherwiſe; but we ask you nothing for aſſiſting you. 9. I had never one hundred pounds to my ſelf, and therefore could maintain no more help; (two Aſſiſtants I had) but have you no more to maintain Aſſiſtants? Now judge how well your hiſtorical Inſtances ſerve your turn.

And beſides the number of Souls, very many Pariſhes are ſo wide, that diſtance forbiddeth many to come to the publick Pariſh Churches: Some Villages are five miles, ſome four, and many three miles off; and how can Families, eſpecially Women, Children, and the aged, and eſpecially in winter, go ſo far twice (or once) a day: And muſt all theſe forbear to hear, or to worſhip God, for fear of being counted Schiſmaticks?

Becauſe the Dr. appealeth to my ſelf, I ſeriouſly profeſs that when I had a Paſtoral Charge, (which was but in one place) I would have been very thankful to any one that differed no more than the Dr. and I do, that would have gathered a Congregation of ſuch, as for number or diſtance could not have come into the Pariſh Church; and the caſe of diſtance did occaſion the honeſt ſeparation aforeſaid, though the caſe of numbers did not: Yea when hundreds deſired Communion according to the Common Prayer, I never offered to hinder any of them from taking it where and how they would.

Sect. 14. *P.* 99. He ſaith [*This is Mr.* Baxter's *own Caſe—when he is pinched with the Point of Separation, thus he declares*, that *his hearers are the*

the ſame with ours; at leaſt ten or twenty for one.—If this be true, then what ſuch mighty help is this to our great Pariſhes, what colour or pretence is there from the largeneſs of them, that he ſhould preach to the very ſame men that come to our Church.—Then how come they to be lawful when few or none of thoſe many thouſands ever come.—to ſpeak ſoftly this pretence is not becoming Mr. Baxters *Sincerity.*

Anſ. what hope of Juſtice from ſuch Judges? Or what hope of profiting ſuch Readers by Diſpute, as cannot anſwer ſuch as this themſelves. When I began to preach at St. *James*'s the neighbours aſſured me, that many of the hearers had been at no Church of four years; but they were Members of the Pariſh-Church, and that ſome of them got into the Church, but rarely: and ſome liked it not ſo well as to be forward ſeekers. When I was driven thence, I preached a while where Mr. *Wadſworth* was in *Southwark*: There were ſome people that had adhered to their old ejected worthy Paſtor, and ſome that I knew not. Since then I preach once on the Lords day in another mans Pulpit, as near St. *James*'s as I could, and the ſame perſons that heard me there do (many of them) come hither, and ſome others: of all whom I know very few, but by report. On Thurſdays I preach a Lecture in another mans Pulpit to perſons of whom I know not many: but report ſaith, that ſome of them joyn not ordinarily with the Pariſh Miniſters, and ſome do, and moſt judge it lawful, and ſometime, but ſeldom practiſe it: And thoſe are of two ſorts: ſome that prefer the Nonconformiſts Miniſtry, and ſome that finding the Pariſh Churches crowded, and many preſent are out of hearing, do ſeldom go thither, though they are of the Pariſh Churches, and diſſent not from their Miniſtry or Worſhip: ſome ſay [*we have no Seats and cannot ſtand*:] ſome ſay [*we cannot hear the Miniſter:*] ſome ſay, *Thouſands ſtay away that can get no room, and will go no whither elſe, and when we can go elſewhere, we will not crowd in firſt to keep them out, that ſo much need Others muſt be out if we be in.* Theſe are your own Church-Members: they hear you ſometimes, but ſeldom. Others that hear you conſtantly on the Lords days, will think that a Sermon on the week days may be needful to them whatever you think or ſay againſt it. And is it *inconſiſtent with Sincerity* here to plead the peoples neceſſity. It's well that our Sincerity is not to ſtand or fall to your judgment. Did I ſay that my hearers are *conſtant hearers* in your Churches? Can you perſwade the World, while you deny not that half or a quarter of your own Pariſh cannot hear you (much leſs many greater Pariſhes) that if ſome of them do but ſometimes crowd in, perhaps once in many months or weeks, by coming with the firſt, and do but dwell in the Pariſh and own you, that they have no need to hear or worſhip God

publickly all the reſt of the year, and to pretend ſuch need becometh not Sincerity.

2. And as to thoſe that meet in leſſer Pariſhes, you thought not meet to take notice of my anſwer, aſſigning many Reaſons, which I will not repeat, any further than to tell you. 1. That many Churches there are unbuilt. 2. Many come from the greater Pariſhes to them: and ſome have other Reaſons.

Sect. 15. *P.* 102. He ſaith [Mr. *Baxter hath a whole Chapter* (*Plea p.*141.) *of Reaſons againſt the Communion of Laymen with our Church.*] *Anſw.* You are unhappy in Hiſtory, though it be your ſtrength. There's not a word to prove it unlawful for Laymen to have Communion with your Churches, but only the Matter of Fact named, which is ſuppoſed to the Controverſie; But it being cunningly worded by you, it may be by [*Reaſons againſt Communion with our Churches,*] you meant but as I did (*Reaſons for Nonconformity in thoſe particular Acts:*) But do you not your ſelf all-a-long ſuppoſe and plead, that though we conform not, yet we ſhould hold Communion with you. Why call you then the Reaſons of Nonconformity, Reaſons againſt Communion.

Sect. 16. *P.* 103. He adds [*in the ſame Book he ſaith, it is Schiſmatical in a Church to deny Baptiſm without the tranſient Sign of the Croſs, or for want of God-fathers,* &c. *or to deny Communion to ſuch who ſcruple kneeling. Now if the Church be Schiſmatical, then thoſe who ſeperate in theſe things are not.*

Anſw. 1. Say you ſo! Then we are not only quit, but further quit than we can own our ſelves. I undertake to prove that it may be Schiſm to ſeparate from a Church that is guilty of ſome Schiſmatical Acts and Impoſitions. And it needs no proof, but the plain Hiſtory, and their Accuſations of one another; that there are few, if any Churches on Earth that are not guilty of ſomewhat that is Schiſmatical, in *Eaſt*, *VVeſt*, *North* or *South*, in *Africk*, *Aſia*, *Europe* or *America*; Greeks, Muſcovites, Jacobites, Abaſſines, Neſtorians, Armenians, Georgians, Mengrelians, Circaſſians, Papiſts, Lutherans, Calviniſts, Prelaticalls, Presbyterians, Independants, Anabaptiſts, *&c.* And muſt we ſeparate from them all.

2. Verily Sir, denying Perſons, *Chriſtendom and Church-Communion* are great things. And if a *Croſs and a geſture forbidden by the Ancient Councils in Adoration every Lords Day*, be now matters ſo weighty, as for them to deny Chriſtendome and Communion, for ſhame call them *Indifferent* no more: one would verily think that when you writ your Defence of Archbiſhop *Laud* you had been of another mind, if words are any notifying Signs of your mind. 3. Other Paſtors may be uſed, in ſuch inſtances without

without ſeparating from you, Sir theſe are not impoſſibilities to peaceable men. In both the places where I formerly preached, a *publick Miniſter* and a *private* lovingly joyn as aſſiſtants, one doing that part which the other cannot. And they all live in peace.

Sect. 17. I am next aſſaulted *Pag.* 110. I ſay [*The Benefit of Chriſtian Love and Concord may make it beſt, for certain ſeaſons, to joyn even in defective Modes of Worſhip, as Chriſt did,* &c. *though the leaſt defective muſt be choſen when no ſuch Reaſons ſway the other way.*] Reader, is not this true? Will not the denyal of this drive us from the Pariſh Churches, and from almoſt all, or require us cauſeleſly to chooſe ſins of omiſſion. Would you not take him for a ſeparatiſt that is againſt this. But he ſaith [*And hence we take notice* 1. *That no Obligation to the Peace and Unity of this Church as they are Members of it, doth bring them to this occaſional Communion with it, but a certain Romantick Fancy of Catholick Unity by which theſe Catholick Gentlemen think themſelves no more obliged to the Communion of this Church, then of the Armenian or Abiſſine Churches: Only it happens that our Church is ſo much nearer.*

Anſw. 1. This is not true: For 1. we take this Church to be far leſs corrupt than the *Armenian* or *Abiſſine.* 2. We have more Obligations to it from the civil Magiſtrates, Laws and Protection, &c. 2. Is nearneſs ſuch a trifle with you. How much do you differ from Mr. *Cheny.* Tell us, why we ſhould be of your Pariſh Church rather than of one an hundred miles off, but for nearneſs and Cohabitation; why elſe of old had each City its own Church? 3. *Is Catholick Unity become a Romantick Fancy.* Is this the ſame man that wrote the Defence of Archbiſhop *Laud*, we are not aſhamed of the title of Catholick. 4. If I name *one Obligation* to Communion with you, is it a learned Note to gather *that I deny all other*? 5. When prove you that I am only for *occaſional Communion* when I have ſo long practiſed *conſtant Communion with you?* Theſe are reaſons ſuitable to your cauſe.

Sect. 18. He adds [*Ask him what Church he is a Member of: If he anſwer, he could have occaſional Communion with all tolerable Churches, but was a fixed Member of none, would they* (*if he were at* Jeruſalem) *take ſuch a man for a Chriſtian? What? a Chriſtian and a Member of no Church. And I much doubt whether they would admit ſuch an one to occaſional Communion,* &c. *Anſw.* 1. Wonderful! Who would have thought that this man had been ſo much for the Principles of Separation (more than the Independants) In his defence of *Laud* he maintaineth that the *Power of the Keys is formally in the whole Church, and given to* Peter *as their Repreſentative* (which is not true, for it was given only to Paſtors as ſuch and not to the Laity.) And now he would make that man *no Chriſtian* that is no *fixed Member* of ſome particular Church. Let us examine whether this be true.

publickly all the reſt of the year, and to pretend ſuch need becometh not Sincerity.

2. And as to thoſe that meet in leſſer Pariſhes, you thought not meet to take notice of my anſwer, aſſigning many Reaſons, which I will not repeat, any further than to tell you. 1. That many Churches there are unbuilt. 2. Many come from the greater Pariſhes to them: and ſome have other Reaſons.

Sect. 15. *P.* 102. He ſaith [Mr. *Baxter hath a whole Chapter* (*Plea p.*141.) *of Reaſons againſt the Communion of Laymen with our Church.*] *Anſw.* You are unhappy in Hiſtory, though it be your ſtrength. There's not a word to prove it unlawful for Laymen to have Communion with your Churches, but only the Matter of Fact named, which is ſuppoſed to the Controverſie; But it being cunningly worded by you, it may be by [*Reaſons againſt Communion with our Churches,*] you meant but as I did (*Reaſons for Nonconformity in thoſe particular Acts:*) But do you not your ſelf all-a-long ſuppoſe and plead, that though we conform not, yet we ſhould hold Communion with you. Why call you then the Reaſons of Nonconformity, Reaſons againſt Communion.

Sect. 16. *P.* 103. He adds [*in the ſame Books he ſaith, it is Schiſmatical in a Church to deny Baptiſm without the tranſient Sign of the Croſs, or for want of God-fathers,* &c. *or to deny Communion to ſuch who ſcruple kneeling. Now if the Church be Schiſmatical, then thoſe who ſeperate in theſe things are not.*

Anſw. 1. Say you ſo! Then we are not only quit, but further quit than we can own our ſelves. I undertake to prove that it may be Schiſm to ſeparate from a Church that is guilty of ſome Schiſmatical Acts and Impoſitions. And it needs no proof, but the plain Hiſtory, and their Accuſations of one another; that there are few, if any Churches on Earth that are not guilty of ſomewhat that is Schiſmatical, in *Eaſt*, *VVeſt*, *North* or *South*, in *Africk*, *Aſia*, *Europe* or *America*; Greeks, Muſcovites, Jacobites, Abaſſines, Neſtorians, Armenians, Georgians, Mengrelians, Circaſſians, Papiſts, Lutherans, Calviniſts, Prelaticalls, Presbyterians, Independants, Anabaptiſts, *&c.* And muſt we ſeparate from them all.

2. Verily Sir, denying Perſons, *Chriſtendom and Church-Communion* are great things. And if a *Croſs and a geſture forbidden by the Ancient Councils in Adoration every Lords Day*, be now matters ſo weighty; as for them to deny Chriſtendome and Communion, for ſhame call them *Indifferent* no more: one would verily think that when you writ your Defence of Archbiſhop *Laud* you had been of another mind, if words are any notifying Signs of your mind. 3. Other Paſtors may be uſed, in ſuch inſtances without

without ſeparating from you, Sir theſe are not impoſſibilities to peaceable men. In both the places where I formerly preached, a *publick Miniſter* and a *private* lovingly joyn as aſſiſtants, one doing that part which the other cannot. And they all live in peace.

Sect. 17. I am next aſſaulted *Pag.* 110. I ſay [*The Benefit of Chriſtian Love and Concord may make it beſt, for certain ſeaſons, to joyn even in defective Modes of Worſhip, as Chriſt did,* &c. *though the leaſt defective muſt be choſen when no ſuch Reaſons ſway the other way.*] Reader, is not this true? Will not the denyal of this drive us from the Pariſh Churches, and from almoſt all, or require us cauſeleſly to chooſe ſins of omiſſion. Would you not take him for a ſeparatiſt that is againſt this. But he ſaith [*And hence we take notice* 1. *That no Obligation to the Peace and Unity of this Church as they are Members of it, doth bring them to this occaſional Communion with it, but a certain Romantick Fancy of Catholick Unity by which theſe Catholick Gentlemen think themſelves no more obliged to the Communion of this Church, then of the Armenian or Abiſſine Churches: Only it happens that our Church is ſo much nearer.*

Anſw. 1. This is not true: For 1. we take this Church to be far leſs corrupt than the *Armenian* or *Abiſſine.* 2. We have more Obligations to it from the civil Magiſtrates, Laws and Protection, &c. 2. Is nearneſs ſuch a trifle with you. How much do you differ from Mr. *Cheny.* Tell us, why we ſhould be of your Pariſh Church rather than of one an hundred miles off, but for nearneſs and Cohabitation; why elſe of old had each City its own Church? 3. *Is Catholick Unity become a Romantick Fancy.* Is this the ſame man that wrote the Defence of Archbiſhop *Laud*, we are not aſhamed of the title of Catholick. 4. If I name *one Obligation* to Communion with you, is it a learned Note to gather *that I deny all other*? 5. When prove you that I am only for *occaſional Communion* when I have ſo long practiſed *conſtant Communion with you?* Theſe are reaſons ſuitable to your cauſe.

Sect. 18. He adds [*Ask him what Church he is a Member of: If he anſwer, he could have occaſional Communion with all tolerable Churches, but was a fixed Member of none, would they* (*if he were at* Jeruſalem) *take ſuch a man for a Chriſtian? What? a Chriſtian and a Member of no Church. And I much doubt whether they would admit ſuch an one to occaſional Communion,* &c. *Anſw.* 1. Wonderful! Who would have thought that this man had been ſo much for the Principles of Separation (more than the Independants) In his defence of *Laud* he maintaineth that the *Power of the Keys is formally in the whole Church, and given to* Peter *as their Repreſentative* (which is not true, for it was given only to Paſtors as ſuch and not to the Laity.) And now he would make that man *no Chriſtian* that is no *fixed Member* of ſome particular Church. Let us examine whether this be true.

CHAP. VI.

Q. *Whether he be no Christian that is not a fixed Member of a particular Church?*

Sect. 1. HE that is a true Member of the Universal Church, which is Christs Body, is a true Christian: But many are Members of the Universal Church, which are no fixed Members of any particular Church. *Ergo.*

2. All that are rightfully Baptized are Christians, (for it is their Christening.) *But many rightfully Baptized are no fixed Members of any particular Church.* *Ergo.*

3. He that hath all the Essentials of Christianity is a Christian: But many that are no fixed Members of a particular Church have all the Essentials of Christianity. *Ergo.*

4. *A fortiore*, They that are not so much as bound in Duty to be fixed Members of a particular Church, though Baptised, are not unchristened for want of such Membership. But many Baptized person are not so much as bound in Duty to be fixed Members of a particular Church. *Ergo.* Instances.

1. The Eunuch baptized in his Travails *Acts.* 9 was only a Member of the Church Universal. 2. Those that were converted by *Frumentius* and *Edesius* when there was no particular Church: And all that are first converted in any Infidel or Heathen Land before any Church be formed. 3. Those that by Shipwrack are cast on heathen Countries where no Churches are. 4. Travellers that go from Country to Countries (as *Lythgow* did nineteen years, and others many.) And I think he unhappily named *Jerusalem*, where Travellers come that are of no fixed Church (unless he in that also be a Superindependant, and think that men may be many years Members of a Church many hundred miles off, which they have no personal communion with.) 5. Merchants and Factors, who are called to dwell long among Infidels where are no Churches. 6. Embassadors who by their Princes are sent to reside among such, much of their lives. 7. Wanderers that have no fixed habitations; as many Pedlers and other poor wandering Tradesmen, and loose Beggars that have no Dwelling. 8. Those thot live among Papists or any other Christians who impose some sin as a condition of communion. 9. Those that live among such Christians as have no true Pastors who are constitutive parts of

of particular Churches. Some being incapable through insufficiency, some by Heresie and some for want of a true Call: Such as by Mr *Dodwells* Doctrine most of the Christian World are, for want of uninterrupted rrue Episcopal Ordination. 10. Those who are subjects to such as permit them not to be fixed Members: As Wives hindred by Husbands, Children by Parents, and some Subjects violently hindred by Princes; who yet allow them transient Communion. And verily a man would think by the writings of many Conformists, that they took it for a Duty to obey a Prince in such a case. 11. Those who live where Church-corruptions are not so great as to make transient Communion unlawful, but so great as to make fixed communion seem to be a culpable consent: If I come in travel to a Church of Strangers, I am not bound to examine what their *Discipline is*, what their *Lives be*, or how *their Pastors are called*: But where I am fixed I am more bound to know these, and if I find them exclude Discipline, live wickedly, and have unlawful Pastors, I may in some cases be a partaker of the sin if I fix among them. 12. They that live in a time and place of Schism and distraction, striving who shall prevail, and condemning each other, all following several Factions, and needing Reconcilers: It may for a time become in prudence the duty of peacemakers, to own no Faction, nor to be more of one Church than of another, while he seeth that it will do more hurt than good; And those that wait in hope as the Nonconformists now do, to see whether their Rulers will restore them to reformed Parish Churches, may at once in prudence find it needful, neither to fix as Members in some Parish Churches till reformed (in the Teachers at least) nor to seem to be Separatists by gathering new Churches. In none of all these cases is a man unchristened, nor schismatical, for being no fixed member of any Church besides the Universal. And as it is the ill hap of these men commonly to strike themselves, I doubt they will prove *Grotius* himself no Christian, by this Rule, who for many years before he died, they say joyned with no particular Church, as a fixed member. And I know not well what particular Church they make the King a Member of.

Sect. 2. To his Questions *Pag.* 3. [*Were we not Baptized into this Church, and do you not Renounce Membership? This is scarce a civility.* I answer, 1. This Church! which Church do you mean? I was not Baptized into St. *Giles*'s nor St. *Andrew*'s Parish Church, but into one above an hundred miles off, and yet my removal made me no culpable Separatist. Or doth he mean, This *Diocesan Church?* No; I was Baptized in the Diocess of *Lichfield*. Doth he mean *This National Church*; as it is supposed a political body constituted of the Ecclesiastical Governing and Governed Parts

Parts, he ſaith there is no ſuch Church of *England*; but that it inferreth Popery to aſſert ſuch. But if he equivocate here, and mean not by a *Church* as in the reſt, but either a *chriſtian Kingdom*, or an *agreeing Aſſociation* of many Churches, I am ſtill a fixed member of ſuch a Kingdom, and of ſuch an Aſſociation in all things neceſſary to Churches and Chriſtian Communion. 2. But *Baptiſm as ſuch* entred me only into the Univerſal Church; much leſs did it fix me in any other. I was Baptized where I was to ſtay but a little while. And this phraſe of [*being Baptized into our Church*,] is to me of ill ſound or intimation. *Bellarmine* ſaith that all that are baptized are interpretatively thereby engaged to the Pope: I was baptized in a Pariſh, and in a Dioceſs, and in a Chriſtian Kingdom; but not ſo *into them*, as to be obliged to continue under that Prieſt or Biſhop or in that Kingdom. And my Baptiſm I hope did not oblige me to every Canon, Ceremony, Form, or Sin of the aſſociated Churches in *England*, abuſively by him called *one Church*. 3. And unhappily it is not meer Independancy that he is ſtill pleading for, but ſome extremes which the moderate Independants diſclaim, *viz.* That a member of their Churches is ſo tyed to them, that they may not remove to another without their conſent. And am I ſo tyed? to what, to Parochial, or to the Dioceſan, or to the aſſociation of Engliſh Churches. If it had been to the *Species*, I would fain know whether their things called by them *Indifferents* ſpecifie them.

Sect. 3. *P.* 111, 112. He yet more pleads as for Separation [*why then above once or twice? why ſhould I ſo countenance defective Worſhip and not rather reprove it by total forbearance of Communion,*] *&c.* *Anſw.* My Reaſons I told him, becauſe the accidents may continue which made it a Duty, but I cannot hinder others from yielding to his arguments: Let him make his beſt of them. Only I muſt tell him yet 1. that if he lay his cauſe on this, that their Parochial or Dioceſan Churches are not defective. 2. Or that the defects cannot by others be avoided, he will quite marr his matter, and undo all by overdoing. 3. And if he indeed think that all defective Churches muſt be forſaken, he will be one of the greateſt Schiſmaticks in the World. But who can reconcile this with the ſcope of his whole Book?

Sect. 4. *P.* 112. He ſaith, *Here are no bounds ſet to peoples Fancies of purer Adminiſtrations. Anſw.* Have I ſo oft and copiouſly named the bounds, and now is the anſwer, [*Here are none.*] Are there none in all the ſame Books he citeth? 2. Scripture is their bounds, as he well openeth in his defence of Biſhop *Laud*.

Sect. 5. *P.* 114. He complains of my leaving out the beſt part of his

his argument, *viz.* [*The people may go to the Anabaptists and Quakers.*]

Answ. Alas that such things should be the best to such a man! By [*May go*] you mean, 1. *lawfully*, 2. or *eventually*, 3. or *for want of due hindring.*] The Reader may think that you by Calumny father the first on me, as if I said, that so to go to the Quakers were no sin, whereas I still say that if they do but leave your Churches by any culpable Error it is their sin. 2. And as to the *Event*, many not only *may* but *do*, turn Quakers, Papists and Athiests, 3. And as to the third, it's all the question here (not whether we should seek to save them but) which is the true reasonable and allowed means, Whether it be the Patrons choosing for all *England* the Pastors to whose care they must trust their Souls, and laying them in Jail that will choose others? Or whether there be not a righter way. And again I say, Kings and Patrons choose not mens Wives, or Physicians, or Food, and every man hath a charge of his Soul as well as of his Life, *Antecedent to the Kings* or Patrons charge.

Sect. 6. *But why* (*saith he P.* 11. *v.* 115.) *must the King bear all the blame, if mens Souls be not provided for, &c?* *Answ.* He that is the chooser must bear the blame, the King for Bishops, and the Patrons for Parish Priests if they mischoose. And do you think in your conscience that all the Patrons in *England* of so various minds and lives, are like to choose only such, in whose pastoral conduct all that care for their Souls should rest. Yea though the Bishops must Institute them as they Ordained them. When we heretofore told them of the multitudes of grosly ignorant, drunken Priest, their answers were, 1. Their Chaplains examined them. 2. They had certificates. 3. *A quare impedit* lay against them if they required higher knowledge than to answer the Catechism in Latine. And now experience will not warrant us to know what such men are. *P.* 115. He asketh *How it is possible on these terms to have any peace or order in an established Church.* *Answ.* I have fully told him how in a whole Book of concord, And hath their way caused greater peace and order? Yes, to themselves for the time. So Popery keepeth some Order and Unity with them that hold to it: But it kept not the Greeks or Protestants from forsaking them.

Sect. 7. P. 119. 120. He saith, [*They only look on those as true Churches which have such Pastors whom they approve.* *Answ.* Equivocal words: 1. If they approve not those whom they should approve, it is their sin. 2. *Approving* is either of the *necessaries ad esse*, or only *ad melius esse*. They must not put the later for the former. 3. *Approving* is by a *Governing* or but a *discerning private Judgment*. The first they have not, but the later. In good earnest, would he have all the people take those for true Pastors,

Paſtors, who they verily think are none. Can they at once hold contradictions? And if they muſt not judge as diſſenters, what meaneth Mr. *Dodwels* and ſuch mens Arguments to prove all no Miniſters that have not Succeſſion of Epiſcopal Ordination? Muſt not the people on that account diſown them, by his way?

Sect. 8. *p.* 119. He brings in againſt us my words [*I take thoſe for true Churches that have true Paſtors, and thoſe for none, that have* 1. *Men uncapable of the Paſtoral Office,* 2. *or not truly called to it,* 3. *Or that deny themſelves the eſſential Power. Anſw.* He knoweth that I ſpeak not of equivocal but proper political Churches. And is it poſſible that ſuch a man ſhould diſſent in this? 1. *Can he be a true Paſtor that is uncapable of the Office?* Shall I abuſe time to confute groſs Contradictions? Or if he be a profeſt Infidel, Can he be a Chriſtian Paſtor? 2. Is a Layman a true Paſtor that is not truly called to it? why then do they argue as Mr. *Dodwell?* or Re-ordain men. 3. Can a man be a Paſtor againſt his will, or that conſenteth not, but renounceth it? or can that be a true Paſtoral Church that hath no Paſtor? Verily we are but upon low works, if theſe be the things which we muſt prove.

Sect. 9. He adds, [*And one or other of theſe he thinks muſt, if not all the parochial Churches in* England *fall under.*] *Anſw.* I read theſe words of the Dr. to a Papiſt, [*To ſpeak mildly, this is a groſs untruth.*] Therefore I hope it were no *Rage* for me to have ſaid the like. How doth he prove it? Nay in the place cited by him I not only profeſt the contrary, but gave the Reaſon, *p.* 65. [*Becauſe I judge of their Office by Gods Word, and not by the Rule which deprives them of an eſſential Part.*] And 1. He citeth my confeſſion that thoſe that I hear preach well (and therefore are not uncapable men.) 2. That their Ordination hath all eſſentially neceſſary, and all the worthy men that I know have the communicants of the Pariſhes conſent, though not Election, and therefore are called, 3. And many of them (as he) thinks they have all eſſential to the Office and diſown it not, though I think others deny it them, where there is the truth of what he ſaith.

Sect. 10. *p.* 120. *Becauſe my practice* diſproveth him, he finds out a *Subtilty*, that I *joyn not with the Pariſh Churches as true Churches, but only as Chappels or Oratories—he accounts not our parochial Churches as true Churches, nor doth communicate with them as ſuch—a Subtilty beyond the reach of the old Browniſts. Anſw.* Deliberately to print ſuch untruths ſeems tolerable in him, but to *ſay they are ſuch* would ſeem paſſion in me, and what other anſwer are they capable of?—What I expreſly ſay of the three forementioned excepted ſorts, he feigneth me to ſay of all or moſt of the Pariſh

Pariſh Churches; and yet dare not deny the truth of any one of the Exceptions. 1. Do not all thoſe men take the Pariſhes for no proper political Churches, but only for *Parts* of the *Dioceſan Church*, ſuch as we call *Curates Chappels*, who ſay that a *Biſhop is a conſtitutive Part* of a *true* political Church and entereth the Definition, and that it's no Church that hath no Biſhop, and that Dioceſan Churches are the loweſt political. And do I need to tell him how conſiderable theſe men are among them. 2. Doth he himſelf take any one of theſe for a true political Church? When I was young, divers Laymen by turns were our publick Reading Teachers: Among the reſt one was after proved to counterfeit *Orders*. This mans acts were no nullities to us that knew it not: but when we knew of ſuch muſt we take them for true Paſtors, and it for a true Church?

Sect. 11. *p.* 221. He ſaith, [*Any Parochial Church that hath ſuch a one* (*a Biſhop or Paſtor over them that hath the power of the Keys, and owns it ſelf to be Independant*) *he allows to be a true Church and none elſe.*] *Anſw.* More and more untruths. 1. Where do I ſay [*that owns it ſelf to be Independant,*] as if that were neceſſary to its being. 1. Doth he not confeſs that I own general Viſitors or Archbiſhops and appeals? 2. That I own *Aſſociations* which he makes the ſtate of the Church of *England*? 3. That I own Synods for obliging concord? 4. That I own the Magiſtrates Government of all? Is there no dependancy in any of theſe, or all? what dependancy more doth he aſſert? 2. As to the *Power* of the *Keys*, dare he come into the light and tell us, whether *any power of the Keys*, that is, of the Government of his particular Church be eſſential to the Paſtor of a true organized governed Church or not. If not, is it not a contradiction to call it a *governed Church?* If yea then is he a Paſtor that wants what is eſſential to a Paſtor? But if they will call a *forcing Power*, or the preſent ſecular Mode of their Courts, by the name of the *Keys*, I never ſaid that theſe are eſſential to a Church, nor deſirable in it, but am a Nonconformiſt becauſe I will not by Oath or Covenant renounce (juſt) Endeavours to amend it.

Sect. 12. *p.* 121, 122. The next Accuſation is, [*They leave it in the peoples Power notwithſtanding all legal Eſtabliſhments to own or diſown whom they judge fit.*] *Anſw.* He tireth me with putting me on repetitions. 1. They can unjuſtly judge of none and diſown them without ſin. It is not I that give men power to ſin, no more than *Power to die*, or be *ſick*, which is but impotency: would I could give them power againſt it. 2. It is not power to reject any choſen by King or Patrons, from being publick Teachers, or to have the Tithes and Temples, nor to be a Paſtor to others. But it is to have a *diſcerning Judgment whether* one choſen by the Patron be a perſon to whom he himſelf ought to truſt the paſtoral Conduct of his Soul. Either the Dr.

thinks that Laymen have this diſcerning power and duty or not. If yea, is it nothing to him to ſeem thus ſeriouſly to plead againſt his conſcience? If not, I ask him, 1. What meant Chriſt and his Apoſtles to call men to beware of falſe Teachers, to avoid the Leven of their Doctrine, to mark them and avoid them, and turn away from them, and not bid them good ſpeed? 2. What meant all the ancient Churches to forbid Communion with Hereticks? and even ſome Popes and Councils to hear Maſs of Fornicators? 3. What meant all thoſe Fathers and Councils, that make him no Biſhop that cometh not in with the peoples conſent? if not Election. 4. Why will he not be intreated to tell us in what Countries, or with what Limitations the contrary Doctrine muſt be received? Muſt all the people truſt only ſuch Paſtors as the Prince or Patrons chooſe all over *England*? or alſo in *Ireland*, *France*, *Spain*, *Italy*, *Germany*, among Lutherans, Calviniſts, Greeks, &c. ſuppoſing the Law be on that ſide? Muſt we all be of the Kings or Patrons Religion? 5. Is this agreeable to his old Doctrine cited Chap. 1.

Sect. 13. *p.* 122. He adds, [Mr. Baxter *ſpeaks his mind very freely againſt the Rights and Patronage, and the Power of the Magiſtrates in ſuch Caſes, and pleads for the unalterable Rights of the people, as the old Separatiſts did. Anſ.* Is this true? 1. What is it againſt the Right of *Patronage* or *Magiſtrates Power* for me to chooſe who I will truſt the guidance of my Soul with, while I contradict not his power to chooſe publick Teachers, and give the Tithes and Temples, and confeſs that for order ſake I ought to conſent to ſuch as he chooſeth thus, unleſs he put on me a true neceſſity of a better choice? If the King chooſe all the Hoſpital Phyſicians, what wrong is it to him, if I at my own charge chooſe a better for my ſelf when I think elſe ignorance or malice will murder me? Doth he that deſireth (as I ever do) that in ſo great a caſe there may be many Locks to the Church Door, deny any one of them, *viz.* The *Ordainers conſent*, the Magiſtrates and Patrons, and the Peoples. Is this the ſame that the old Separatiſts did? Should *Gloceſter* take *Goodman* a Papiſt for their Biſhop becauſe the King choſe him? Abundance of Patrons in the beginning of Q. *Elizabeths* Reign preſented Papiſts. It ſeems if they were impoſed by Law, and Patrons, you would have the people ſubmit to thoſe that cry down Biſhops, Liturgy and Ceremonies too. Father *Paul Sarpi* tranſlated by Dr. *Denton* will tell you how new a way this is.

Sect. 14. *p.* 122. He adds [*The People are made Judges of the Competency of their Miniſters.*] *Anſw.* They are diſcerning Judges. Doth not your charge imply that you think otherwiſe; and yet you dare not ſay ſo. Muſt they not judge when Forreigners heretofore were ſet over them, whether they ſpeak Engliſh or no? or if a Socinian deny Chriſts Godhead or the immortality

mortality of the Soul, whether he be *Competent* or not? Or if they have an ignorant Curate, that when neceſſary advice for the Soul is asked of him, will ſay no more but [*Trouble not your head about ſuch matters, but caſt away care and live merrily.*] If when the blind lead the blind both fall into the ditch, muſt we not note the difference? Alas how little would ſome men have a man care for his Soul, in compariſon of caring what Phyſick, what Food, what Wife, what Servant, what Trade he chooſeth? Truſt one to the conduct of ſuch as all the Patrons of *England* will chooſe for you, but not any of the other. As to the not cauſeleſs forſaking former Paſtors, he knoweth that it was the ſtrict charge of the old Canons of the Churches; and the Biſhops themſelves do hold the ſame. I thought they ought not to be forſaken becauſe men thruſt them out. The Churches at *Antioch*, *Alexandria*, and many more did oft and long cleave to thoſe Paſtors whom the Chriſtian Emperors caſt out, and reject thoſe whom they impoſed. When I have proved this ſo fully in my firſt *Plea* and Church-hiſtory, what an unſatisfactory anſwer is it for ſuch a Dr. to repeat it and ſay, *This is plain dealing*. Is the Judgment and Practice of the Churches ſo light with him.

Sect. 15. *p.* 123. The next charge is, [*They give directions to the people what ſort of Miniſters they ſhould own, and what not.*] *Anſw.* We do ſo: And I had thought all Chriſtians had been of the ſame mind. It's ſad with the Church when this *Doctrine* needeth a publick defence. Dare he ſay, that all impoſed muſt be owned? Then either Salvation is at the Magiſtrates will, or it's the priviledge of ſuch Countries as have good ones, or a man may be ſaved in any Country Religion contrary to the Article which they all ſubſcribe.

Sect. 16. Next the Accuſer falls on my general Rule, [*The Miniſtry that tendeth to Deſtruction more than to Edification, and to do more harm than good, is not to be owned,*] and his bare recital is confutation. *Anſ.* I muſt profeſs that I am ſo confident of this, that a thouſand ſuch diſſenting Drs. cannot change me: And according to his excellent Rules of judging in the end of his Diſcourſe of Idolatry, which maketh natural Verities moſt certain and fundamental, me thinks it ſhould to him be ſurer of the two than the Goſpel it ſelf: *viz.* That all men ſhould love themſelves, and be unwilling to be damned, and therefore ſhould not own that Miniſtry of man which tendeth more to Deſtruction than to Edification. And when he wrote that cited in my firſt Chap. he was of that mind or he was a moſt groſs diſſembler. But muſt it be otherwiſe? Is it our Salvation that we muſt ſacrifice to Prieſts, Prelates or Princes wills? If our Tithes would have ſerved them, we had not gainſaid them. If our Bodies and Eſtates might have ſatisfied them, we had not ſtuck at it ſo much. But when (*Deſtruction*) ſignifieth (*Damnation*) it is a hard bargain? If we ſhould re-

nounce our Christianity for them, we are never the nearer: for we are still *Men* and therefore loth to be destroyed in Hell? If this be the meaning of the Article which denyeth *free will*, I deny it freely: I have no such *free will*. But O Reverend Fathers, be more impartial: Are you so loth to lose your great Riches and Honor, yea or to have your Reputation so far questioned, as to be contradicted, or have others live by you that preach without your consent; and yet must all the people of *England*, so much deny their own Salvation for you, as to submit to a destroying Ministry? Why then did you before put (*agreement in Doctrine*) among the requisites to our Accusation? must we *agree* and not *judge* whether we agree or not? Why then must not all Hereticks, Papists, *&c.* be received, why then are all your volumnious Accusations produced to prove us justly silenced? and Mr. *Dodwels* to prove us no Ministers of Christ, if we want nothing but a human power to impose us on the Churches, and a Patron to present us? But the best is, when you have talk'd and written your worst, men will be unwilling of destruction; and till the Bible be forbidden, men will read, (*Beware of false Prophets: Let no man deceive you: prove all things: from such turn away: Mark them which cause Divisions and Offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learn'd and avoid them*, and more, 2 *Pet.* 2. *J. Tit.* 3. 10. 2. *J.* 10, 11.

Sect. 17. He adds, (*That we may not think all this to be only a Romantick Scheme, or Fiction,*) he adds, (*that they are not able to confute the people in too many places, who tell them that their publick Priests are so defective in their necessary Qualifications for their Office, as that they hold it unlawful to own such for true Ministers, and to encourage them by their presence, and commit the care of their Souls to such. Anſ.* 1. This is true: we are not able to confute them: If you be rejoice in your Wisdom. 2. Either you would have us believe that *there are none such*, or that no such are to be so *refused*. The first you attempt not: If you did, I would repeat a Catalogue of my old Teachers and Acquaintance: but I have named them to Mr. *Hinkley*. And as to the second, I prove it (a sad task for such a one as you to put us on.) 1. Such as are known to be no authorized Ministers of Christ, should not be owned as such: But all those that want the *necessary Qualifications for their Office are no authorized Ministers of Christ*. *Ergo*. If the Major were not true, Error or Lying were a duty. The truth of the Minor is evident in the terms: *necessarium est sine quo res non esse potest*. It is *Qualifications necessary to the Office in esse*, and not only to the *well performance* that is mentioned. *Forma nunquam recipitur in materiam dispositione necessaria carentem*. But here the *Office is* the forme, and the *necessary disposition of the matter is supposed wanting*. *Ergo*. Again: All men are bound to avoid the apparent means of Damnation: To trust the conduct of our Souls to men uncapable for want of

necessary

neceſſary Qualifications, is an apparent means of Damnation (as excluding an ordinarily neceſſary means of Salvation,) *Ergo*. Again: It is a great ſin to encourage men in the wilful damning of their own Souls, and hindering the Salvation of many others: But to own an unqualified uncapable man as a Miniſter of Chriſt, is to encourage him in the wilful damnation of himſelf (by his prophane undertaking) and in hindering the ſalvation of many others, *Ergo*. I will not recite what *Zechary* and other Prophets ſay of the uſage of falſe pretenders to be Prophets, leſt you miſapply it. Again: No man ought to conſent to the prophane ſubverting of Chriſt's Church-Offices and Ordinances: But to conſent to the Miniſtry of unqualified uncapable men, is to conſent to the ſubverting of Chriſt's Church-Offices and Ordinances. *Ergo*. Can your patience endure unqualified men in the Miniſtry, and cannot endure ſuch as us out of Jail, becauſe we obey you not in all your impoſed Oaths, Words and Practiſes.

Sect. 18. Next he thus confuteth us, (*and directly contrary to the Principles of the old Nonconformiſts, as appears at large by Mr.* Ball *ſaying (If* Can's *meaning be that it is not lawful to communicate in the Worſhip of God with Miniſters not fitly qualified, diſorderly called, or careleſly executing their Office, it is directly contrary to the word of God, ſound Reaſon, and conſent of all the Learned. Anſ.* Who would have thought that this worthy Doctor could not or would not ſee a difference, between (*fitly qualified*) as *ad bene eſſe*, and *unqualified*, or *wanting* the *qualifications neceſſary ad eſſe*, and between (*diſorderly called*,) and (not *called*, or *conſented* to by the Flock at all) and between (*careleſs executing* the *Office*) and not *having* the *Office* as *uncapable*.) He will not ſtrain at ſuch gnats as theſe. And is there no difference between (*lawful Communicating*) and *committing* the *conduct of mens Souls to them as our ſtated Paſtors*. Mr. *Ball* lived not far from me: his intimate Friend Mr. *Aſh* well knew his mind. You may yet know it fully from Mr. *Cook* of *Cheſter*, a ſilenced Miniſter bred up in his houſe and ſometime one of your old Patrons (Sr. *Roger Burgone*) Nonconformiſts, after many others at *Rockſhal* in *Warwickſhire*. Mr. *Ball* was not ſuch an enemy to diſtinguiſhing as to confound *Neceſſaries ad eſſe Officii & ad bene eſſe*.

Sect. 19. But *p.* 124. I am alſo brought as againſt my ſelf for ſaying (*That a Miniſters perſonal faults do not allow people to ſeparate from the Worſhip of God.* 2. *nor all Miniſterial faults, but only thoſe that prove him and his Miniſtration utterly intolerable. Anſ.* 1. A ſtrong proof, that therefore the intolerable may be received, becauſe I ſay, no: I contradict my ſelf by ſaying the ſame things. Perſonal Faults I diſtinguiſhed from Miniſterial and tolerable Miniſterial from *intolerable*, then and now: and is this Contradiction? Do not all do ſo too, till now? Yea in the place cited by him

I 1. ſaid, that as to *perſonal Faults*, as *Swearing*, *Drunkenneſs*, &c. they ſhould get a better man, if lawfully they can. 2. And I named juſt as here the intolerable inſufficiencies, direct *pag.* 747. viz. 1. *An utter inſufficiency in knowledge and utterance for the neceſſary parts of the miniſterial Work.* 2. *If he ſet himſelf to oppoſe the ends of the Miniſtry*, &c. by Hereſie, *Malignity*. And I name the faults that neceſſitate not Separation.

Sect. 20. Next he eiteth my words againſt ſome mens Factious ſeparating humor: And doth it follow that becauſe many are unfit to judge aright, that the people muſt take all obtruded Paſtors, and not judge to whom to truſt the conduct of their Souls? How unfit are the ignorant to judge who is a meet Phyſician, Lawyer, Arbitrator, yea or wife or husband for them: And yet judge they muſt as well as they can: Do you not expect notwithſtanding their unfitneſs, that they judge your Books and arguing to be truer than mine? And is it by your bare authority that they muſt ſo judge?

Sect. 21. But he much blameth me for laying the Caſe far off, when it is the *London Separation* which he queſtioneth where the Miniſters are no ſuch men. *Anſw.* Could any man have ſo far ſearcht his heart as to know that he ſpake only againſt Separation in this one City? When there is no ſuch Limitation in his Book, And when the ſame Laws, the ſame Silencings, Fines, Impriſonments, accuſations of the Preachers are all over the Land. But I am glad for the peace of the Nonconformiſts elſewhere, if it concern not them. 2. As to *London*, he knoweth that I give the Preachers due honour, and that I juſtifie not any unneceſſary Separation of the people from them, nor of the Conformiſts from the Nonconformiſts. I gave him an account of my own Practice and the Reaſons of it: Let other men give account of theirs, I know very many of my mind. 3. And he knoweth that I oft told him that many things make good mens actions culpable in ſome degree, that make them not criminalls, odious, or to be ruined. And that I gave him many of their Extenuations. 4. Among the reſt, verily (to uſe his own Phraſe) it *looks ſomewhat odly* by the Church Law or Canon *ipſo facto to excommunicate many ſcore thouſands* in the Land, meerly for profeſſing to take ſome things impoſed to be ſin, and then to revile and proſecute them as Schiſmaticks, for not communicating with you. 5. And I told you that Laws and the higher ground are not always the *Terminus a quo* of *Schiſm*: Some of them were never of your Flocks, and therefore never ſeparated from you, but as you do from them (and ſomewhat leſs.) 6. And the Kings Licenſe firſt, and proclaimed Clemency often, gave them ſome poſſeſſion as the Law giveth you. 7.

And

And Plague, Fire and thouſands that cannot hear you, made it neceſſary. But *ſome Pariſh Churches are not full.* *Anſw.* I ſee none of thoſe, I come in divers where many cannot hear the Preacher; and would you have more? And again I tell you, 1. They keep meetings in leſſer Pariſhes to receive thoſe that come out of greater. 2. If thoſe come to you, they muſt keep out others. 3. When it is commonly known that in their own great Pariſhes there is not room, it's hard for Families to look about the City for room in uncertain places. 4. And all perſons that culpably diſlike you are not therefore to be forſaken.

Sect. 22. But the ſame man that citeth my Reprehenſions of Separation asketh me, *why I do not diſown it*; as if he preſently forgot what he had written. I diſown Schiſm, and therefore the greateſt in the ſinful Church-tearers that ſmite the Shepherds, and then cry out of the Flocks for being ſcattered: And I diſown the leaſt, but not by Cruelty but in Charity.

Sect. 23. *p.* 127. He repeats the *Incapacities* named by me, (*viz.* in *Knowledge* and Utterance, by Hereſie, *&c.*) and ſaith, *Of all theſe the people are judges, and ſo may ſeparate: Thus no ſetled Church can ſubſiſt*, &c. *Anſw.* 1. It's a hard caſe that in ſuch 2 Volumn as this, he will not tell us his own Judgment, further than the accuſing of ours intimateth it (which if we tell him of, he can ſay, [*It was not his ſenſe.*] Will he openly ſay that the people have not a private Judgment of diſcretion in order to their own practice, whether the Preacher be an Heretick, Papiſt, Infidel, Idolater, or not? but muſt take him for their Paſtor be he what he will? I know he will not ſay it. What then would he be at? Why doth he accuſe us for that which he dare not contradict? Doth he any where tell us, *in what caſes and how far they muſt judge?* No, he ſhuns all ſuch Queſtions as tend to bring the cauſe into the light: put twenty and he will anſwer few or none of them. If he did, perhaps we ſhould be agreed whether he will or not.

But (Reader, bear theſe tiring Repetitions as I muſt do) 1. He knoweth that it is the *Ordainers* and not the people whom I make judges who *ſhall be a Miniſter*. 2. That it is the King and Patrons that I make the only Judges who ſhall be tolerated, and maintained by them, and have the Tythes and Temples. 3. And that though the Univerſal Church was many hundred years, for the peoples Election, I plead *ad eſſe relationis* for no more as neceſſary but conſent, *who ſhall be the Paſtor*, to whom they will truſt the conduct of their Souls: And this is but *Judicium diſcretionis & privatum non publicum regentis*, only guiding each mans own obedience to God. 4. He knoweth (if he will know) that I ſay and ſay again, that the advantages of the Laws and Rulers Favour, and the

Tythes

Tythes and Temples, and Pariſh Order, and national Aſſociation, are ſo great advantages to the Service of God, that no man ſhould be deprived of them, and go another way, but upon neceſſity, and very great and urgent cauſe. But I intend God willing, further to prove to him that [*when* 9000 *Miniſters are all required to ſin or ceaſe their Miniſtry, a neceſſity is put upon them to exerciſe it againſt ſuch Prohibitions as farr as they can without doing more hurt than good; And that the ſinful complyance of* 7000 *will not excuſe the other* 2000 *for this duty.*] And this is the caſe which a friend of truth ſhould have debated.

Sect. 24. *p.* 126. *But* (ſaith he,) *How ſhall a man eſcape being thought Heretical by the people. Anſw.* 1. See his own anſwer here, Chap. 1. 2. How ſhall one get all the world to be wiſe and good? If I knew, I cannot procure it. But put the caſe within your ſight? How will you eſcape being judged no rightful Poſſeſſor of your Deanry, or Prebend, or the King's Chaplains place, or the Pariſh Church of St. *Andrews*? I know not how: And yet if an Uſurper accuſe you here, and ſay *e. g.* that the Church of St. *Andrews* is his and not yours, muſt not the people *judge* which of you they will take for the Uſurper, and which they will joyn with and obey? In the times of Uſurpation, many of the people judged the Biſhops to be none of their Paſtors, nor the ejected Miniſters; muſt not the reſt therefore judge that they were? Where Uſurpers deny the King's Right, ought not the people to judge him to have right, becauſe they may err? and what *Prince* or *Prelate* may not the people judge Uſurpers? What Landlord may not the Tenants deny? What Maſter the Servants? What Husband the Wife? But muſt they not therefore be diſcerning Judges, who is their Landlord, Maſter, Husband, What Schoolmaſter may not unlearned men miſcenſure? What Phyſician may they not vilifie? And yet they ſhall judge and chooſe for themſelves, and ſpeed accordingly, who can help it? deny men a judgment of diſcretion to guide their own choice and actions, and you contradict mankind, and deny men to be men. What in the world is more abuſed than Reaſon and Freewill? and yet men muſt act by Reaſon and Freewil. It's unworthy a Divine to cry out againſt a thing for ſuch unavoidable Inconveniences, as humane darkneſs and badneſs do neceſſitate, and to ſwallow Camels on the other ſide and take no notice of the miſchiefs thereof, nor once to tell us how to eſcape both.

Sect. 25. He inſtanceth in mens cenſure of me for the *Doctrine of Juſtification and asketh, Are men bound to ſeparate from me? Anſw.* One would think by many ſuch words that the Doctor did ſeriously believe that I had ſaid, that all men *are bound to follow an erring Judgment, and to ſeparate when they falſly judge* they ought. If

If he think not that I ſaid ſo, I would not name his fault leſt I more offend him: If he think I ſaid ſo, I had hoped weaker Readers could have better underſtood me. When I read in the Books of ſome Conformiſts yet living whom I much honour, that to obey Conſcience though it err is to obey God, I took it for my duty oft and copiouſly (eſpecially in my Chriſt Direct.) to open that caſe, and to prove that *Conſcience* is no Law-maker, but only a diſcerner of Gods Law, and that an erring Conſcience involveth a man in ſin whether he followeth it or not; becauſe God changeth not his Law when we change our Judgments of it. But yet there are ſome caſes in which it is a farr greater ſin to go againſt Conſcience though it err than with it. The Dr. dare deny none of this. And doth ill if he would perſwade men that I deny it: and that God makes it mens duty to do ill whenever they judge it good, or forſake good, when they judge it evil.

Sect. 26. But the great offence is *p.* 130 that *I inſinuate that the whole Body of the Church is guilty of great Faults, Conformity being a ſcandalous thing with thirty tremendous Aggravations.—And no wonder if men ſo judging prefer others, &c. Anſw.* Again and again I ſay, 1. This is unrighteous dealing; To impoſe all thoſe things on us; To caſt us out of the Miniſtry and Churches for not obeying: To Fine and impriſon us, and accuſe us as Schiſmaticks and Seditious, To write and preach for the execution of the Laws againſt us, to our Ruine: To aggravate our Crime becauſe we tell them not our Reaſons; To call us to tell them what we ſtick at; To threaten to get the King to force us to give our Reaſons; To declare in Preſs and Pulpit that we wilfully keep up a Schiſm and have nothing to ſay for it; To continue all this when we have been ſilent ſeventeen years, as fearing that they could not bear it; And after all this when we diſavowed any Accuſation of them, and only told them what we feared our ſelves, to come upon us with this charge of *deep accuſing their Conformity*, is injuſtice if there be any in the World. Either it is ſin or no ſin which we fear. If none, why are we not confuted? or invited yet to give our proofs? If ſin, who ſhould be moſt offended? To be yet plainer with you, had the caſe been in the times of the old Prophets and Prieſts, I queſtion whether to let ſuch a Kingdom alone ſo long in that which we judge to be ſo great ſins, would not have been heavily charged on the Preachers: And I profeſs that my conſcience is more in doubt whether my ſo long forbearance was not my ſin, than whether ſaying or doing what I did was ſin: And I had nothing to ſatisfie it, but the men that I ought to judge wiſer than my ſelf, perſwaded me that it would have done more hurt than good, and cauſed but our further ſuffering. And I think

the Conformists should have been desirous to help them to try whether it were sin or not, and to have been thankful for helping to save them from it, if it proved such. But though hence I extenuate the too great withdrawings of some men against their too deep accusations, he knoweth that notwithstanding all these aggravations, I neither justified nor practised proper Separation.

Sect. 27. *p.* 133. The next charge is that I make them Usurpers, *viz.* 1. *All that come into the place of the ejected Ministers, at least to the people that consent not: But Law and Usurpation are contrary. Answ.* 1. I never said that all are Usurpers to all the people that consent not: If the body of the Church consent the man is no Usurper, though some odd persons consent not. He is the Churches Pastor, though not the refusers. 2. I never said that any that had the Law for them, were Usurpers of the Tithes and Temples. 3. I never said that all that succeed ejected Ministers are Usurpers; many of them have the Churches after-consent, though not their Election. Yea I often said, 1. That it is the peoples duty to consent to the change when it is for the Churches good. 2. And that their constant Communion signifieth their consent. But I will not believe yet that the *Law* will prove a man no Usurper of the Pastoral Relation. And when I have so largely proved the contrary to be true, and to be the judgment of the ancient Churches, it's an unsatisfactory course to me, to leave it unanswered, and suppose himself in the right. Not only the first 300 years, but even under *Constantius, Valens, Theodosius Junior, Zeno, Basiliscus, Anastatius, Philippicus, Justinian, &c.* even the Patriarchal Seats practised the contrary, keeping their chosen Pastors and refusing those imposed by the Emperors; and other Bishops Seates the Emperors seldom meddled with as to the choice. Yea in *Arcadius*'s days *Chrysostomes Joannites*, in his imperial City were of another mind. Is his *Rule true only* in *England*, or in *France, Spain, Italy, Muscovy, &c.* also, or where, that the Law maketh men true Pastors?

Sect. 28. But *p.* 132. he said [*that he detesteth the Principles that set mans Laws above Gods*, and that in *stating* the *Controversie he supposed an Agreement in all the Substantials of Religion between the dissenting parties of our Church. Answ.* Of all things you are the unhappiest in *stating the Controversie.* The Instances here were 1. Insufficiency through Ignorance, 2. Heresie, 3. Malignant oppugning the very ends of the Ministry, 4. No true calling. 1. Doth he agree with us in all the Substantials of Religion who knoweth not the very essentials of Christianity? *Ignorantia non est Consensus.* 2. Doth he agree with us in all the substantials that is a Heretick? or if we fally judge his opinion Heresie, do we agree with him?

3. Is

5. Is malignant oppoſing Godlineſs and pleading for prophaneneſs or ungodlineſs an agreement in all the Subſtantials? 4. What if we agree in all Subſtantials with an unordained Layman impoſed on us? is he therefore our true Paſtor? 5. But how ſhall we know whether we agree or not, if we are no judges of it? Do you not ſee your own Contradictions? who ſhall judge whether the Paſtors or People agree? ſhall the Prince or Patron? If you know the Teachers heart, how know you the Peoples? Muſt we believe that we agree, becauſe you ſay ſo? If the people muſt judge whether they *Agree*, they muſt judge of the things in which the *Agreement* is, that is, both the *Paſtors Doctrine* and their own minds. And is not this to judge whether he be a Heretick, &c. or not? And who ſhall judge whether the diſagreement be in *Subſtantials*? It muſt be the agreers. And they muſt be wiſer than I if they can learn from you here, what is a *Subſtantial*, and how to know it.

Sect. 29. It may be he will ſay, that *where Princes and Parliaments are Orthodox, none are Uſurpers, but true Paſtors whom they impoſe. Anſ.* But doth not *this* make the people Judges whether *Princes and Parliaments are Orthodox*, and is not that as dangerous as to judge of the Teachers? And Orthodox Princes and Parliaments may impoſe Heretical Teachers: and may by Law enable Patrons and Prelates to impoſe them. What more natural than to propagate what men like, and oppoſe what they hate? If the many hundred Patrons in *England* be all orthodox and pious, and free from Schiſm, &c. we are ſtrangely happy: If not we may expect that they chooſe accordingly. *But the Biſhops will ſecure us. Anſ.* 1. They have not done. 2. They ſay *they cannot by Law.* 3. Would it be any wonder if Biſhop *Goodman* of *Gloceſter* kept not out any Popiſh Teacher? Or if ſuch Fathers of the Church as Archbiſhop *Bramhall* let in ſuch as would have the *Pope Govern us all by the Canons* as Patriark and *principium unitatis*, and all paſs for Shciſmaticks that conſent not to ſuch a forreign Juriſdiction, contrary to our National Oaths.

Sect. 30. As to his inſtance of *Solomons* putting out *Abiathar*, &c. I anſwered it fully (and many more objections) in my firſt *Plea*, and will not write the ſame again for him that thinks it not worth the anſwering or taking notice of.

Sect. 31. When p. 138, 139. he *makes it the way to all imaginable Confuſions*, to deny, 1. that *the Kings Nomination of Biſhops*. 2. and the *Patrons of Pariſh Paſtors* proveth them no Uſurpers, but true Paſtors, is he not an unreverend diſhonourer of Biſhops himſelf, who maketh them all that for a thouſand years held the ſame that I do, to be the authors of all *imaginable Confuſion*? Is he not unreverend to their Canons? and to antiqui-

ty? and to the universal Church it self? Whatever in his third part he Cavils against it, he cannot be so strange to Church-history as not to know that they were commonly against him.

Sect. 32. The matter of the next accusation is *p.* 139, 140. having said *Plea p.* 41. 42. [*If any make sinful terms of Communion by Laws or Mandate, imposing things forbidden by God on those that will have Communion, and expelling those that will not so sin*] I add [*If any should not only excommunicate such persons for not complying with them in sin, but also prosecute them with Malice, Imprisonments, Banishment or other Persecution to force them to transgress, this were heynous aggravated Schism.*] *Ans.* And is not this true? or doth his bare repeating it disprove it? Is he a zealous Enemy of Schism that taketh all this for none? I did not steal it out of his defence of Archbishop *Laud*, but less than this is there made Schism. Yet he tells us that he *sets not mans Laws above Gods*, nor *pleads* for Persecution. But lest the repeating of my words should shame the Accuser he hath two handsome devices. 1. He puts [*complying with them in sin, that is, Conformity,*] as refused, instead of [*those that will not so sin, in sinful terms of Communion forbidden by God,* &c.] 2. He forgeth an addition as mine [*and therefore it is no sin to separate from such*] when I have no such words, being only there telling what is Schism, and not *what is* not. I confess it will sound odly to say [*It is Schism not to communicate with those who excommunicate, imprison and banish me by Law, if I will not do that which God forbids, and they make a Condition of my communion.*] For I must not sin: And in prison and Banishment under Excommunication they deny me communion. And yet I say not that it's always faultless, For if they do not execute their own Law, in some cases, where publick good requireth it, I may best communicate with them as far as they permit me without the imposed sin, till they do execute them. But this excuseth not their Schism.

Sect. 33. *p.* 140. *He blames me as charging him with the silencing design. Ans.* I did warn him in real desire of his safety: If defending the *Church-Laws and Endeavours* for our restraint, in the words to which I refer the Reader: If preaching and writing against our preaching as Schism, and all the rest in his Books do signifie no owning of our silencing, I am glad that he meaneth better than he seemeth: who could have thought otherwise that had read 1. his first Q. whether it be not in the power of those that give orders to limit and suspend the exercise of the ministerial Function. Q. 2. And whether the Christian Magistrate may not justly restrain such Ministers from preaching, who after the experience, do refuse to renounce those Principles which they judge do naturally tend to involve us again in the like trouble. And Serm. *p.* 42. *the Church of England's endeavours after Uniformity*

Uniformity is acquitted from Tyranny over the Conſciences of men, by the Judgment, &c.] *And p.* 54. condemning them as *hard thoughts of the Biſhops* that *in cruelty* they *follow Ithacius*, &c. And in this new Book, more ſuch might have deceived a man that judged by his words. And his arguing that it is unlawful to preach to them becauſe it is unlawful to hear; What was the meaning of all this if not ſilencing us?

Sect. 34. *p.* 140. The next Crime is [*Plea p.* 42. *As long as they ſuppoſe the terms of our Communion to be ſinful, they ſay, The Schiſm doth not lie on thoſe that ſeparate, but on thoſe that do impoſe ſuch terms: and therefore they may lawfully ſeparate from ſuch impoſers.*] *Anſ.* It's hard to know what words to uſe to detect all theſe hiſtorical untruths without being thought paſſionate. 1. I never ſaid that (*ſuppoſing them ſinful*) will juſtifie a falſe ſuppoſer, but have oft ſaid the clean contrary (*their ſuppoſing*) is of his forging. 2. I ſaid not (*the Schiſm doth not lie on thoſe that ſeparate*) but only that it's *Schiſm in the Impoſers.*) This alſo is his Fiction. 3. And I ſaid not (*and therefore they may lawfully ſeparate from ſuch impoſers.*) But all Readers will not ſtay to find out his Forgeries. But how much of this he ſaid once himſelf, ſee in my Chap. 1.

Sect. 49. But here he comes to ſome cloſing diſtinction, which ſhould have gone before; [*Between terms of Communion plainly and in themſelves ſinful; and ſuch as are only fancied to be ſo through prejudice or wilful ignorance, or error of conſcience.*] *Anſ.* What a deal of labour might he have ſpared himſelf and us, if he had here fixed the Controverſie in the beginning; we thankfully accept your late diſtinction: we ever deſired here to put it to the Iſſue; If it be through *prejudice wilful* Ignorance or Error that we judge Conformity a ſin, not only Separation but *Nonconformity* is *a ſin.* If we do not prove ſome parts of Conformity (for one is enough) to be *plainly ſinful*, which are impoſed as Conditions of our Miniſterial Communion, and ſomewhat impoſed on the people as conditions of all that part of your Communion, which I ever diſſwaded them from, let the blame be ours.

Sect. 35. He paſſeth next to them that *deal more ingenuouſly than I in owning* Separation. And then returneth to me *p.* 151. and he over and over repeateth his falſe accuſation, [*that I think it Lawful to communicate with them occaſionally, but not as Churches* (*as thinking they want an eſſential part*, viz. *a Paſtor with Epiſcopal Power*) *but as Oratories, and ſo that I renounce Communion with their Churches as Churches.*] *Anſw.* If theſe untruths had been made *without evidence only*, and not alſo *againſt evidence*, they had been the more excuſeable in a man of conſideration. But now they are not ſo, when I have ſo often declared that I take the Pariſh Churches that have true Paſtors for true governed Churches, and prove that they have true Biſhops (*Epiſcopos Gregis*) whether the Dioceſans will or not, becauſe Gods Will

and

and not the Inveſters, inſtituteth their Office, and meaſureth their power; and the people ſhew their conſent by conſtant Communion.

Sect. 36. Then becauſe [*I never gathered a Church, nor baptized any in 20 years, nor gave the Sacrament in* 18,] he would know [*what Church I have been of all this time,*] and he ſuppoſeth [*of no Church.*] *Anſ.* I thought he had done with this before: but he thinks it an advantage not to be ſo eaſily let go. Would he know. 1. What my *Thoughts* were? 2. Or my *Church-Covenant*? 3. *Or my* actual *Communion?* He ſhall know all. 1. I thought divers Miniſters where I lived true Paſtors, and the Churches true Churches: I cannot ſay ſo of every Curate. 2. I made no Covenant with any of them: If I had Mr. *Cheny* would have condemned me of Atheiſm, Infidelity, and what not. 3. With divers of them I went conſtantly to the Liturgy, Sermon and Sacrament, as with true Churches, with ſome of them I only joyned in prayer and hearing, I heard Dr. *Rieves* till he cauſed me to be ſent to Jail, and then I could not: And though I was accuſed by many for hearing a ſwearer, I told them, he ſwore not in the Pulpit: I heard his poor Curate conſtantly, when I was accuſed for hearing a Drunkard, and told them that he was not drunk in the Pulpit. But I muſt tell you, I communicated alſo with ſome Nonconformiſts. And now account me of a Church or no Church as you pleaſe. I doubt you are renewing the Independant Queſtions with me, which I am loth to diſpute. 1. Qu. Whether an ordained Miniſter muſt be a private Member of another mans Church? Q. 2. Whether when a Non-reſident Dean leaveth his Pariſh to an ignorant drunken Curate, the Pariſh Church be eſſentiated by its relation to the Reſident Curate, or the Non-reſident Dean? Q. 3. Whether a Miniſter not degraded but ſilenced, living in ſuch a Pariſh is bound to take that Curate for one that hath the Paſtoral Charge of his Soul, and the reſt of the flock to commit his Soul to his Paſtoral Conduct in perſonal, private and publick Offices? 4. But I would ask the Dean himſelf, whether a man may not be a fixed Member of two or three Churches at once? The Reaſons of the *Quare*, are 1. Becauſe (by them) a man may be the fixed *Paſtor* of two or three Pariſh Churches at once: And an Integral Member of many is not ſo hard a caſe, as to be a conſtitutive Regent Part of many. 2. Becauſe a man may have two houſes in two Pariſhes at once; As many Londoners have half their Family at a near Country houſe, and half at a City houſe, and are themſelves part of the week or day at one, and part at the other. And they make Covenants with neither, but what *actual Communion* intimateth. Q. 3. And if ſo why might not I at once be judged a Member of two Churches at once, ſo far as I communicate oft with both? I therefore anſwer his queſtion further,

further, *what Church I was a Member of?* 1. I was a Member of Christs Universal Church? Is that none? and yet is in the Creed? 2. I was a Member of the reformed Church if your will call that *One* because associated in one Reformed Religion. 3. I was a Member of the Church of *England*, both as a Christian Kingdom, and as the Churches in *England* agreeing in the Christian Reformed Religion. 4. I was a Member of the Provincial Church of *Canterbury*, so far as living peaceably in it, and submitting both to such power as they had from the King as Magistrates and a meer general helping instructing care of many Churches could make me. 5. So far also I was a Member of the Diocesan Churches where I lived. 6. And I was a Member of some Parochial Churches so far as constant Communion could make or prove me: And of others (two at once) so far as partial and moveable Communion could prove me. If this will not satisfie you, I have proved before (and oft to some Independants) that many men are under no obligation to be fixed Members of any Parish Church: (whether the King be of any I know not.)

Self. 37. But *p.* 152. he comes upon me, *why I thought it was my duty all this while to Baptize, Administer the Sacrament, was I not solemnly bound by Ordination to use as well as the other? Presbyters of old were rarely allowed to preach.*] *Anſ.* 1. You tell the World what measure we must expect from such as you. If we had all forborn any Church-gatherings, and Pastoral undertaking of Flocks, and both Sacraments, &c. and only preached as loth to offend you more than needs, our accusations had but been the greater? which incourageth your more *ingenious Dissenters* to do what they also are accused of. 2. Do you not know our Reasons? They are these: 1. Because we suppose there is a greater want of our preaching, than of our administring Sacraments: And we would obey the [illegible] all things lawful; and go from you and offend you no further than [illegible] will justifie us. 2. Because a Ministers Relation to the Church [illegible]ful and to the world ceaseth not, when his relation to a Parish Church may cease: And we have not the same obligations to give the Sacrament to all the Christians or World where we preach, as we have in a Parish Charge. *Paul* thanketh God that he baptized not many Corinthians, because he was not sent to baptize but to preach the Gospel; nor is the terrible charge 2 *Tim.* 4. 12. equal as to both. 3. Our Ordination bound us to preach and administer Sacraments, when we are thereto lawfully called: And we were so called to one, when we were not to the other: nor were all of us so called alike. But when we know that this way doth as much offend you, we may go further in due time. And do you in one part of your Book blame us for going further than the old Nonconformists (as you

you thought) and in the second thus accuse us for not going further.

Sect. 38. He is again at his talk of only *occasional Communion*? And had his mistake no *Occasion*? yes; he that readeth my Books may see what: that is, 1. When I have said that some Parishes having not capable or called Pastors I take to be no true Political Churches; but yet can communicate with such as Oratories or Chappels. 2. That some true Churches I communicate with in *transitu* or occasionally as strangers, whose Discipline and Ministers Calling I am not bound to take account of. 3. I tell those that withdraw too far and take some true Churches for none, that were it so they might occasionally join with them as Oratories, 4. And those that dare not commit their Souls to the Pastoral Conduct of some weak and bad men, that yet they may occasionally communicate with them upon great and urgent Reasons. And here he gathereth his oft repeated untrue Reports.

Sect. 39. p. 156. He grants there is no Separation *where there is no Obligation.* And he will prove us obliged to *constant Communion* with them. 1. *Because we must use all lawful means for Peace and Unity. Anſ.* 1. We are ready to prove that our *Conformity*, nor our *forbearing to preach* the *Gospel* are no lawful means. 2. Can you as well prove, 1. That it is not lawful for you to joyn with us? 2. And to forbear silencing, excommunicating, fining and imprisoning us? Was it no lawful means for *Peace* and *Unity* to have forborn imposing all the Covenants, Professions, Subscriptions, Oaths and Practises, of what you call indifferent and we think sinful? 3. And is it not lawful for Parents to enter their own Children at Baptism in Covenant with God? 4. Is it unlawful to Christen such as scruple your use of the Cross? 5. Or to receive those to Communion that scruple your Gesture? 6. [illegible] forbear Canonical Excommunicating all professed Nonconformi[illegible] Land? 7. Or to let Lords and Gentlemen choose any Nonconfo[illegible] to be Tutors to their Children, whilst the Papists may send theirs to *Doway*, St. *Omers*, &c. He saith, he is [*perswaded it is one of the provoking sins of the Nonconformists, that they have been so backward to do, what they were convinced they might with a good conscience. Anſ.* Woe to us, if we be not willing to know our sins. But 1. If you will tell me of any one lawful thing that I have omitted, that tended to Peace, I will thank you. 2. An indifferent thing is no means of Peace when it will do more hurt than good. To cease the Ministry we durst not: To use some indifferent forms in your Churches we could not, being cast and kept out. And to use the same to those that are against them; when it will hurt them, and procure no peace with you, and those have sped worst from you that have come nearest you, and nothing will serve but all; what tendency

dency hath this to Unity? You know my own case proveth all this. I regarded not the censures of any that go too far, so as to keep me from doing what I judged lawful: And did it tend to peace? No, one sends me to Jail when I went twice a day to his Church: Others say, *He is like an Ape, that is so much the more ugly because he is like a man*; Another more sober saith, [*I know not what to make of Mr. B. He communicateth with us, and he preacheth to the Nonconformists: Like a man that will go one step on one side the hedge, and another step on the other.*] And this man is much in the right: for I say still, [*It is the separating hedges in Christ's Vineyard that I hate, and the enclosing hedge* that I am for: I have Business, Friends, Relations and great Duties on both sides the hedge, some with you and some with others; And if your hedges would separate Parents from Children, Husband and Wife, Christian Neighbours, &c. causelessly I will not be so separated, but do my best to pull down that hedge. And again consider whose sin it is, that so *many lawful things* are denyed us for *Uniey*. Hold but to your Rule here and we are agreed. And he seemeth to consent. For,

Sect. 40. *p.* 176. Of the Rule *Phil.* 3. 16. he saith, [*If I will but allow that by virtue of that Rule men are bound to do all things lawful for the preserving the peace of the Church, we have no further difference about this matter. Ans.* It's well he will say so much of the Rule, we gladly consent. Then all the question is, what's lawful on both sides? I add one Q. more. Is it not lawful for peace to forbear forcing men to disoblige 1000? whom they never knew, from being obliged by an Oath and Vow to that part of the matter which is good? If it be the conjunction of some things bad, that disobligeth them, then he that inserteth a bad thing is free from all obligations of his vow, even *in materia licita & necessaria*. And if the want of *imposing Power* be made the cause, whether is the Co[illegible] Oath imposed by a superior Power on the King, or is it his own [illegible]? or is he therefore not obliged by it? Had it not been requisite that you should have justified all that we stick at as unlawful, before you charge us with crossing this Rule?

Sect. 56. *p.* 204, &c. My words in many Books against Schism are cited and praised; Reader, he tells men the measure of their Charity and Church Communion, *viz.* That men that do as much as I do, that forbore so long Sacramental Administration, that gathered no Church, that held constant Communion with divers Parish Churches, that have wrote so much and earnestly against Schism, shall yet be ejected, silenced, pay 40 l. a Sermon and lie in Jails unless I will do more. While Bishop *Laud* design for widening the Church doors to the Papists, is magnified by *Heylin* and others as a good work.

Sect. 13. First he finds but *two* justifiable Causes of Separation; but p. 213, 214. he hath found *three and no more.* 1. *Idolatrous Worship:* 2. *False Doctrine imposed instead of true.* 3. *Making and imposing things indifferent as necessary to Salvation.* *Anſ.* 1. Readers, do you remember how even now he expoſed to *odium*, the peoples judging whether the Paſtors be Hereticks? And now they may ſeparate for falſe Doctrine. 2. I intreat him to think again of theſe Caſes following. 1. What if the Worſhip be not Idolatrous, but Blaſphemous, or utterly Ridiculous, tending to contempt of God? 2. What if it be in an unknown Tongue? 3. What if the Church have no true Miniſter? I am glad you are not for ſeparating for want of Epiſcopacy or Epiſcopal Ordination? 4. What if the Church want half the Church-Worſhip? as to have Preaching and Prayer without Sacraments? or Sacraments without Preaching or Prayer, or Preaching without Prayer, *&c.* 5. What if the Church be but ſchiſmatical? Have you written all this Book, to draw men to you from the Independant Churches, and do you now tell us that the people may not ſeparate from them. on the account of Schiſm? 6. What if a Church require me to tell or ſubſcribe to one known Lie, or to ſay, that I believe what I do not: or to juſtifie thouſands that I think obliged by a Vow, if they break it? What if they impoſe any one ſin on me without which they will not receive me to Communion? 7. What if I remove for my Edification from a drunken ignorant Prieſt, to the Church of a wiſe and holy Paſtor? 8. Are we looſer than Pope *Nicholas* that forbad men to hear Maſs from a Fornicating Prieſt? 9. I would you had ſpoken to Edification and told men what *falſe Doctrine it is that will allow Separation*, and whether it's *falſe Doctrine preached*, or only *ſuſpected* on the perſon to be owned? If the former, *is it all falſe Doctrine* or but *ſome*, and what? Verily, if all, you are tenfold more a Seperatiſt than I: For I look to hear ſometimes ſome words of falſe Doctrine in moſt Pulpits, even of Conformiſts? If it muſt be hereſie it ſelf, I will not ſeparate for once hearing it, if the Church profeſs it not. If it be *impoſed Error* that you mean, take heed leſt you juſtifie Separation from your Church, by the new Article of Infants certain Salvation. And whether both Arminians and Anti-Arminians ſubſcribe the 39 Articles, tell us whether thoſe Articles are true in both their ſenſes, or whether the ſence be not the thing ſubſcribed? or whether one half of them ſhould ſeparate. You are too unmerciful to your ſelf; but what kind of Churches ſhould there be upon your terms? I find no more in his ſecond part which I have not already conſidered.

Chap.

CHAP. VII.

The Reply to his Third Part: The beginning.

Sect. 1. IN his third Part I first find my self accused p. 242, &c. And that is not only by insisting on a false accusation of my words, but adding a confutation of himself, as if he discerned not that he did it. In *Treat. of Concord* I say, [*If it holdeth that God instituted only Congregational or Parochial Churches, as for present Communion, then none of the rest instituted by man may deprive them of their privileges granted by Christ.*] I put it but with an (*If it be so*) because I told them my own doubt of it. After I say, [*To devise new species of Churches without Gods Authority, and impose them on the World; yea in his name, and call all Dissenters Schismaticks, is worse Usurpation than to make and impose new Ceremonies and Liturgies.*] And can any Christian deny either of these? But he saith, [*This supposeth Congregational Churches to be so much the institution of Christ, that any constitution above these is unlawful and unsupportable;*] which is more than the *Independant Brethren do assert.* And is any word of all this true? 1. The Independants much insist on this? I refer him now but to *Ames. Medul. de Eccl. Minist.* 2. Do the words suppose that which is plainly excepted in them? If it were granted. 1. That the Congregational only are so instituted. 2. And that others are not set over them by God, 3. And yet are obtruded in his name, without his authority, 4. And all Dissenters called Schismaticks,] then I say they are unlawful. 5. To confute himself plainly he confesseth that I say, *The question is not whether the* Archbishops *should be over the particular Churches, as Successors to the Apostolical and General Overseers of the first Age in the ordinary continued parts of their Office.* Nor whether Patriarks, *Dioceſans, Lay-Chancellors as Officers of the King, exercising Magistracy be lawful.*] And yet he saith that I suppose the contrary. He next pretends to give my Reasons: And the chief is, *because it overthroweth the species of Gods making*; when I only say, *That which overthroweth it is unlawful*; which is not the Archbishops that are over the lower Bishops, but those that put them all down, and governed the Carkalles of the mortified particular Churches as the lowest Bishops of many score or hundred such as themselves. And he saith I am for the *full exercise of Discipline within the* particular Church; while he confest I spake not against Archbishops. And yet he saith, *This is a fair representation of my opinion,*

ad

Sect. 2. Coming to prove our Episcopacy the same with the Primitive he pretendeth to confute me: That which I asserted was, 1. That by the first Institution, and Constitution, every Church no bigger for number of Souls than one of our great Parishes had a Bishop of their own, (one or more I disputed not.) 2. Yea that for the first two hundred years if not more, no one Bishop had a Church so big as some of our Parishes, at least except *Alexandria* and *Rome*, and even of them it is not certain that they had more Souls. 3. That after by degrees the case was altered: But yet after there were many *Meetings* like Chappels, a while there was but one Altar. 4. After that those Chappels had Altars, but so as that at certain times of the year, the people of the Cities and next parts were all to communicate with the Bishop, and were no more than could meet to choose the Bishops, and to be present as to the main body of them, and disciplinary debates, to give consent. 5. In *Cyprian's* time at *Carthage* (a place of greatness and great numbers of Christians) the Church was grown very great, but not beyond the exercise of such personal Communion as I described: And the Bishops there and round about being worthy men, kept up the life of the former Discipline. And as great as their Church was, we would be glad of such an Episcopacy, Order and Communion. For I oft told you, that by *present Communion*, I meant not that all must meet in one place at once, (For the tenth part of some Parishes cannot:) But that as Neighbours and Citizens, may have personal Converse and Meetings *per vices*, of some at one time and some at another, as different from meer mental Communion, or by Synods or Persons delegate, or as their Governours or Representatives, and this for mutual Edification in holy Doctrine, Worship and Conversation. And that the footsteps of this remained long, when worldly Reasons had made a change.

And all this I have proved so fully in my Treatise of Episcopacy besides what's said in my Abstract of the Episcopal History, that till some man shall confute the full Evidence of Antiquity there brought, I have no more in Reason to do upon that subject. And though the Doctors History of this be the most considerable part of all his book, yet so far doth he leave what I say uncontradicted, that I find not one word that he saith against any of my Testimonies, not any for his own cause, for the first two hundred years: But when he should have proved the extent of the Churches at two hundred years, he begins his historical Proofs at two hundred and fifty for three or four great Cities in the World, and so proceeds to *Augustine* at above four hundred, and *Victor Vticensis* about four hundred and ninety, *Theodoret* four hundred and thirty, (where he

he supposeth me to say that of his City, which I said of the Diocess of that City:) And to confute all impertinencies, and groundless Suppositions, while my full proofs are unanswered, is but loss of time.

Sect. 3. His chief argument is, [*that no City how great soever was to have more Bishops than one.*] *Ans.* 1. He can prove no such Rule in the first two hundred years. 2. See how well the defenders of Prelacy agree? *Grotius* (*& de Imperio & in Annot.*) and Dr. *Hammond* I cited, who say that Cities at first had two Bishops in each (*Rome, Antioch, &c.*) one of Jewish Christians, and one of Gentile Christians, and saith *D. H. Peter* at *Rome* was Bishop of the *Jews*, and *Paul* of the *Gentiles*, and they had two Successors; and saith *Grotius* The Churches were formed to the manner of the *Synagogues*, and there were divers Churches with divers Bishops in the same City (in 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. *& de Imp.* p. 355, 356, 357.) 3. In the fourth Century a Council at *Capua* decreed that the two Bishops with their several Churches at *Antioch* (*Flavian's* and *Evagrius*) should live together in Love and Peace. 4. This was a good custom while there were in the Cities no more than one Bishop might take care of: And the custom held when times altered the case and reason of it: And Possession and the Desire to avoid division made it held up by good men. 5. I have at large in my Treatise of Episcopacy confuted the opinion of appropriating Bishops to Cities; and so did the old Churches that set up *Chorepiscopi*.

Sect. 4. *p.* 259. He saith, [*In Cities and Dioceses under one Bishop were several distinct Congregations and Altars.*] *Ans.* 1. Yes, no doubt, after the second Century, and perhaps in two Cities a little before; but in few in the World till towards the fourth Century. 2. This is the same man who in the very Sermon which he defendeth said [*p.* 27. *Though when the Churches increased the occasional Meetings were frequent in several places, yet still there was but one Church, and one Altar, and one Baptism, and one Bishop, with many Presbyters assisting him: And this is so very plain in Antiquity, as to the Churches planted by the Apostles themselves in several parts, that none but a stranger to the history of the Church can ever call it in question.*] But when I told him how this would agree us, and hurt his cause, he will quickly fall under his own censure, and became [*a stranger to the history of the Church*] asserting many Altars in one Church of one Bishop. This Sermon was written since his *Irenicon*. And now he feigneth a distinction between [*An Altar taken with particular respect to a Bishop: and for the place at which Christians did communicate.*] But what was the Altar that was taken with particular respect to the Bishop? Was it not the material place of Communion? And so the members of the distinction are co-incident. Saith *Optatus lib.* 6. *Quid est Altare nisi sedes & corpus & sanguinis Christi?* Each Church

Church had long but one of these. The best Altars that were made after the chief Church Altars were not for ordinary communion, but honorary of some Martyrs. The truth is, the phrase of *unum Altare* was taken up when each Church had but one; but to set up *Altare contra Altare* continued after to signifie *Anti-Churches*. But I have fully answered this in my *Treatise of Episcopacy*. His conjectures from the numbers of Officers, *&c.* he may see there also sufficiently confuted and in *Ch. Hist.* And the odd instance of *Theodoret* he doth not at all make credible by his willing belief of *Metius* and other Popish Feigners. And were that Epistle genuine a Cypher is easily dropt in by Corrupters: It hath need of better authority that shall be so singular from the case of all other Churches. And I suppose he knoweth that *Cyrus* was not a simple Bishoprick, but a Metropolitane Seat, and might have 800 Parish Bishops.

Yea whereas there were under *Antioch* seven Dioceses, and fifteen Provinces or as others say thirteen, that yet had many Bishops under them, as *Seleucia* twenty four. *&c.* that were more dependant on *Antioch*, *Cyrus* was one of the eight Provinces or *Metropolis* that were *per se subsistentes*: And therefore when *Theodoret* said how many Churches were under hands, it's like he meant Bishops Churches and not meer Presbyters, and either a Cypher dropt in corrupted the account (or else the Bishops had but single Congregations; But for my part as the case so late concerneth me not, so I see nothing to perswade me that that Epistle is genuine and uncorrupt. But I would not have a Dioces which then had many Provinces, or a Province which had many Bishops Churches, be taken for a single Church.

Sect. 5. The same I say of *Carthage*, which was the *Metropolis* of *Africa*, and the first of six Provinces before *Justinian*, and of seven after, and Proconsular, and the Church called *Africæ Caput* as *August. ep.* 162. The sixth and seventh *Carthage* Councils tell us of the distribution of the Provinces, decreeing three Judges to be sent out of each Province, *viz. Carthage*, *Numidia*, *Byzacena*, *Mauritania*, *&c.* Yea *Leo* 9. *P.* in *Epist. ad Thom. &c.* saith that the Bishop of *Carthage* was *post Pont. Rom. primus Archiepiscopus & totius Africæ maximus Metropolitanus*, (Though yet *Binnius* truly say that in *Cyprian*'s time he was not an Archbishop, that is, no proper Governor of Bishops, because they concluded in Council, *nemo nostrum dicitur Episcopus Episcoporum*; but he was the chief of that great Province. And the Dr. himself out of *Victor* mentioneth one *Cressus* that had one hundred and twenty Bishops under him. He was Metropolitane of *Aquitana* and a Dioces then having many Provinces, how many be in a Dioces *Victor* there tells you that the Bishop of *Carthage* in his own Engitane Province had one hundred sixty four Bishops. And how great were their Churches then?

and

and *L.* 2. when he lamenteth the great number of their banished, Bishops, Presbyters and the Church-members were 4976. And one Parish here hath 40000 if not more. He that considereth that *Cyrus* was at most but 60 miles from *Antioch* the Patriarchal Seat, and that a *Carthage* Council had sometimes 600 Bishops, and the Donatists perhaps had as many; and that as he saith, *Crescens* had one hundred and twenty Bishops under him, and that *Cyprian* so often tells us how Bishops were chosen by all the People, and how he managed his Discipline in the presence of all his *Plebs*, (Laity) and by their consent; and how he telleth that it was the peoples duty to separate from the communion of a sinning Bishop (which implieth communion before) and how the Bishops in Council put the question, When a Church wanted a Bishop, whether one of them that was a Bishop and had perhaps but one or two or three Presbyters was bound to part with one to that wanting Church to make a Bishop of? and considereth the circuit and distance of their Cities, and much more which I have elsewhere named, may well believe large Provinces, and larger Dioceses, but will think of their Bishops Churches as we must do of theirs in *Ireland*, when a late converted Countrey had six hundred Bishops. Make but Christs true discipline practicable, and tie us not to swear or assent to your uncertain forms and we should no further trouble you in this.

Self. 6. As for the credit he giveth to *Sirmondus*'s copy of *Theodoret*'s Epistle, or to the later Editions of his Works, I am not bound to be as credulous, nor to take the last Editions for the best, when they come out of the Jesuits hands: And can prove the Epistle to *Joh. Antioch*, which *Bellarmine* would disprove, to be more credible than this: And it's one blot that he saith *Theodoret*'s Epist. 6. mentioneth the Metropolitane he was under, when he was under none, but was himself an Independant Metropolitane: For so the *Notitia Episc.* tells us, was *Berytus*, *Heliopolis*, *Laodicea*, *Samasata*, *Cyrus*, *Pompriopolis*, *Mopsuestia* and *Adana*. If his Province was as the Epistle cited saith *fourty Miles Square*, and the Christians so numerous as is said, and he name none of the Bishops under him, but number the Churches, it's like they were Episcopal Churches and very small. And that *Villages had Churches* it's no wonder when there were many *Chorepiscopi* not only under the Metropolitanes but the City Bishops. And why I must reject his long received Work if I question his late found Epistles I know not. But again I say, this is nothing to our cause, being so long after the ages I mentioned, & my contrary evidence being not at all confuted His confidence, 260, 261. about some citations out of *Theodoret*, runs upon false Information. That the question is not of the number of Churches, but about the extent of the Episcopal Power, whether it was limited

limited to one Parochial Church, or extended over many: when he knoweth that I had no such question; but whether those whose power was over many Churches in the first two Centuries at least, had not as many Bishops under them over those Churches (if such there were.) Or if the Bishops were of the lowest rank, whether those under were not then denyed to be Churches for want of Bishops, and were not only parts of a Church? 2. And he feigneth me to bring *Theodorets* Testimonies to prove that even then in *Alex.* and *Antioch* a Church was but one Congregation, when I brought it only to prove, that even in that age they were so small, that the footsteps of the ancient shape of them still appeared. Such Fictions may deceive them that will not try what is said, but only read the answerer. But by this citation I see he read my Treatise of *Episc.* before his Book came out. And therefore I will pass by these niblings till he answer it.

Sect. 7. *p.* 262. He accuseth me of [*Rage and Bitterness*] for saying that [*if he will plead for so much Presumption, Profanation of Gods name, Usurpation, Uncharitableness and Schism, as to own their Churches to be new, and devised without Gods Authority, and yet may in his name be imposed on the World, and all Dissenters called Schismaticks,*] *I leave him.* And first he feigneth that I charge him with this; which is untrue, unless he will charge himself with it. But why do I put in [*If you will so plead.*] *Ans.* Because he accused me for saying the contrary, *viz.* [*that so to divise, and so to impose, is worse, &c.* But because I know not why he accused so plain a truth, I said [*If you do so.*] But he now tells me that he (*quoted it to shew that I looked on all Churches beyond Parochial, as Churches meerly of mans devising,*) which is another untruth confessed by himself, who before had this up and cited my own words to the contrary; *viz.* that I believe the Catholick Church and deny not National associated Churches; nor Archbishops that put not down the particular Churches, Pastors and Discipline: one mistake is his excuse for another. Had he meant as aforesaid, had my words *been Rage, or* necessary confutation?

Sect. 8. Yea it is his business in the very next page 263 to confute his own accusation of me by citing my own concessions. And *p.* 264. he giveth me leave to call our Bishops Archbishops. *Ans.* But 1. Archbishops have Churches with their proper Bishops under them. But our Bishops say that there are no such under them. 2. I told you before that as the Major General, Quartermaster General, &c. of an Army constituteth not a distinct body from the Army and the particular Regiments and Troops, so I am not certain that Apostles or Evangelists or any general Preachers as such, did constitute any Church Form distinct from the Catholick

Catholick and the particular Bishops Churches: But if they are supposed to have taken their several fixed Provinces (which I never saw proved) I will not contend whether those Provinces may be called Churches. If we agree about the thing, use the name as you see cause.

Sect. 9. And to your talk of our Bishops being of the same sort, I ask you whether any of the Bishops for 300 years, or for long after save *Cyril Alexand.* by violence, did ever use or claim any power over any Ministers or Christians, besides meer fatherly Teaching, Perswading, urging Gods Word on them, and applying it to the consciences of particular Persons by Admonitions, verbal Censures and Absolutions? Did they meddle by Force, with Body or Purse? Let your Bishops use no other force or way of constraint than the Apostles did, (if they be their Successors) and not lay the excommunicate in Prisons and ruine their Bodies and Estates, *& valeat quantum valere potest.* But Mr. *Glanvile* and many of you tell us, how little you care for it without the Sword.

Sect. 10. If any man will but consider what I cited out of *Greg. Nazianzen* that saith Men unfit were so ambitious to be of the Clergy, that the Clergy was in many Churches almost as many as the Laity; And that Presbyters then were much like the Presbyterians Elders, save that they had the power of Word and Sacraments though they seldom exercised Preaching in Cities, but left that to the Bishop; and that the number of their *Acoluthi, Exorcistæ, Ostiarii, Lectores, Subdiaconi, Diaconi, &c.* made up the great body of them. And the very Boys and Schollars that were bred up under them, yea or but for Church-singing, are sometimes joyned to make up the number, see *Isidor. de Offic. Eccl. L.* 2. even all the Monks, are often numbred with them. And *Victor* cited by him seemeth to number twice the *Infantuli* so bred up with the great number of Readers, to the *Carthage* Clergy, I say he that considers all this, will not judge of the number of people or Churches by the number of the Clergy, as he would do now with us, where the great Parishes have but two or three Priests.

Sect. 11. And as to the cause that I plead for, it is enough that I have proved that even when the name of Bishop was confined to the *Episcopi Pastorum*, yet the Presbyters had the power of the Keys, and were *Episcopi Gregis*, and exercised this power in their distant Countrey assemblies, though under the Bishop, and the Bishop was to exercise his with them as Assistants; so that the particular Churches were not really unchurched.

Sect. 12. *p.* 265. He cometh nearer our controversie, but first falsly stateth the question, supposing that I say that *(the whole power of the Presbyters*

byters is swallowed up by the Bishops.) And is the disputing of a question falsly stated of any profit? I only said that the office of a Church-Pastor or Presbyter hath three essential parts, *viz.* the power of Teaching the Church, of conducting them in Worship, and Governing the people by the use of the Keys. And that he that destroyeth *one part* that is essential (though he swallow not up all the power) altereth the essence of the Office: and that so the English Diocesan Form doth, I have largely proved in my Treat. of Episcopacy which he doth not answer.

Sect. 13. 1. He tells us that the Presbyters are the lower house in the Convocation, and *so have their Votes in passing all the Rules of Discipline, Articles of Doctrine and Forms of divine Service.*] *Ans.* 1. According to his description *the Church of England hath no one Ecclesiastical Government*, either Monarchical or Aristocratical or Democratical: And therefore the Acts of the Convocation are no Acts of governing the Church of *England*, but meer Agreements. Therefore this proveth not the Presbyters power of governing it. 2. If this be a part of Government it is the Legislative Part or the Executive. The later it is not. The former the Lawyers say it is not; King and Parliament only being Legislators. But if this be Legislation, we deny it to be any of the power of the Keys, in question, which is but to judge who is fit or unfit for Church-communion, to Admonish, Absolve or Excommunicate according to Christs Law; and is the execution of Christs Law, and not the making of new Laws. 3. It is *lis sub judice* whether the things here named be any part of true lawful Church-Government: Rules of Discipline Christ hath made enough, except about meer mutable Accidents. Articles of Doctrine man must not otherwise make, than to declare what he believeth Christ hath made. Forms of Divine Service commanded to all others, the Apostles never made, nor that we find appointed any others to make them. If these be lawful by way of agreement of many Churches, this is none of the Power we speak of. Yet he calls this [*one of the greatest Rights of Government*, viz. *making Rules for the whole body*; which he denyeth to have any constitutive Government.

Sect. 14. He saith, [*In this main part of Government our Church falls behind none of the ancient Churches—only there they were taken singly in every City*, &c. *Ans.* That is, 1. When the Ministers of a Diocess choose four, out of whom the Bishops take two, And 2. This only to make agreements, without any governing power over the Church of *England*. 3. And this only about general Regulation. 4. In either unlawful or doubtful Impositions on others about meer Accidents or Circumstances of Order; This is the same or as good as, when every true Church hath present Pastors personally

personally to exercise the executive Church-Government called the Keys, by the Laws of Christ already made, in judging the case of each particular Person, as to his Title to Church-communion and the Kingdom of Heaven. For that is the thing which by us is pleaded for.

Sect. 15. Next he tells us of *four that are to joyn in Ordination and Examination*; when 1. It is not the making or governing of Pastors which I am speaking of, but the Government of the Flocks. 2. He knoweth that it is no strange thing for our Bishops to say, that both in Convocations and Ordination, the Presbyters act only as the Bishops Council, and the Bishops only act by governing authority. 3. I never disputed for Presbyters Power to ordain as essential to them (nor did I ever meddle in any Ordination.) 4. If four Presbyters have such power that proveth not that four hundred have it, that never exercise it, in the same Diocess. 5. If by all this you mean that really Presbyters have the governing Power of the Keys, it condemneth those the more that give it to four and deny it to four hundred or one thousand. 6. When I was ordained none examined us but the Bishops Chaplain, and two or three City Ministers called by the Bishop that never saw us before, meerly *pro forma* laid hands on us with him. But it's well that you give such a power to ordain.

Sect. 16. Next *p.* 267. he comes to the point in question, whether they have the Pastoral Power of the Keys over their own Flocks? And 1. He saith, *One would think the objector had never read over the office of Ordination for them. For the Epistle is read, the Charge given by St.* Paul *to the Elders at* Miletus *Act* 20, *or the third Chapter of* 1 Tim. *concerning the Office of a Bishop. What a great Impertinency had this been, &c?* *Ans.* This is like the rest. I must not suppose that he never read it himself. See Reader, whether any of this be true? Indeed heretofore it was in the Book of Ordination; but we shewed the Bishops that thence Bishop *Usher* in his *Reduction* argued that the Presbyters have some conjunct Power with the Bishops to govern their own particular Flocks, and some true Pastoral Power of the Keys (I was one that oft urged it on them.) And they told us that the Bishop was the Pastor and they but his Curates, and to confute us, *put out both those parts of Scripture from the Book which he saith are in it*; so that neither of them is there: And presently they also put out the very name of *Pastor* given to Parish Ministers, in almost all places of the Liturgy. Doth not all this shew their mind?

Sect. 17. Next he tells us of the Bishops Exhortation, calling them [*the Messengers, Watchmen, Pastors and Stewards of the Lord.*] *Ans.* It was

ſo in the old Book, But the word (*Paſtors*) here alſo is purpoſely put out to ſhew their judgment. Is this juſt dealing, And doth it not confute himſelf? 3. He tells us of the *Promiſe to Miniſter, Doctrine, Sacraments and Diſcipline.*] *Anſ.* The truth is neither in the exhortation nor collation of Orders, is there any mention of any power given him to govern, but only to adminiſter the Word and Sacraments: and thus far the people are called his charge: But in the queſtion, *Diſcipline* is named thus [*as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the ſame, according to the Commandements of God:*] ſo that 1. The Prieſt hereby owneth *that as it is received in this Church and Realm it is according to Gods Commandments*, and 2. Then promiſeth ſo to uſe it: which is 1. To be an *Accuſer*, 2. And as a Cryer to publiſh the Biſhops or Lay-Chancellors *Excommunication* and *Abſolutions*. This is the promiſe.

Sect. 18. And what if the *name of Government* or the Keys had been put in, when it is denyed in its eſſential part? I have proved out of *Couſins* Tables, *Zouch*, and the Canons and actual Judgment and Practice of the Biſhop., that Government or Juriſdiction is denyed to them: And inſtanced in many and moſt acts in which it doth conſiſt, in my Treatiſe of Epiſcopacy. And this being my queſtion, (whether the Engliſh frame depoſe not the ancient Churches (which had every one their own Paſtor with the power of the Keys) and ſo the ancient Offices and Diſcipline.) I am not now concerned about the General Archiepiſcopal Power of the Dioceſans.

Sect. 19. *p.* 269. He ſaith (*that while the Apoſtles lived it is probable there were no fixed Biſhops, or but few.*) *Anſ.* Mark this Reader. 1. If ſo, then while they lived, there were but twelve or thirteen Biſhops in the World, if any. And were then no more Churches that had governing Paſtors? 2. Then if it cannot be proved that the Apoſtles were fixed Biſhops, but ambulatory Apoſtles, there were none in the World in their times. 3. Then the Angels of the ſeven Churches were Apoſtles (reprehended by Chriſt) or meer Presbyters, or of the few excepted Biſhops. Why then doth he himſelf elſewhere argue that there were Biſhops then, becauſe theſe Cities were Metropoles? 4. See what concord is between the chief Doctors of the Church of *England*. Dr. *Hammond* ſaith that it cannot be proved that there were any Presbyters but Biſhops in Scripture times: and ſuppoſeth the Epiſcopal Party of his mind. This Dr. ſaith, (*It's probable there were no fixed Biſhops, or but few.* And ſo they differ. 1. Of the ſence of the Texts that mention Presbyters and Biſhops. 2. And about the guidance of the Churches *de facto* in thoſe times. 3. And if the Apoſtles were not fixed Biſhops of ſingle Churches, they have no Succeſſors

as ſuch. If they were we muſt have but twelve or thirteen Biſhops as their Succeſſors in the World. And which be thoſe Seats? and how prove they their claim?

Sect. 20. To prove the Pariſh Miniſters Paſtoral Power *p.* 272. he tells us of that *he is judge of the Qualification of thoſe that are to be confirmed. Anſ.* 1. Had I ever taken a Pariſh Charge under them, I would have taken more advantage from the new Rubrike about this, than any thing elſe, and then the Biſhops intended. But 1. There is not one of a multitude confirmed, and *deſire* of Confirmation proveth not any underſtanding of Chriſtianity. 2. And if the Miniſter doubt whether they be *Ready* or capable, they may refuſe to give him any account. 3. He is to ſend in the names of ſuch as he *judgeth fit.* But 1. it's only when the Biſhop Summons them. 2. And the Biſhop is no way obliged to confirm no more than the Prieſt approveth of. To prove this, 1. Their ordinary practice is to confirm without the Curates hands: 2. When the Kings Declaration was debated at *Worceſter* Houſe 1661, before the K. Lords, Biſhops and Miniſters, I laboured almoſt only for this that day, to have got in the word (*Conſent*) of the Miniſter of the Pariſh for ſuch as ſhould be Confirmed, ſuppoſing that *one word* would have partly reſtored the Pariſh Paſtors power, and ſo have made our Biſhops tolerable Archbiſhops, that if poſſible we might have been healed. But the Biſhops rejected it with all their might, and got the King to refuſe it: But becauſe I laid ſo great a ſtreſs on it, the Lords and others that were to collect and publiſh the Conceſſions, when we were gone put it in for that time, and at the Convocation the Biſhops caſt it all away. Did they not tell us then their ſence? And they call him only the *Curate* of the Pariſh, and not the Paſtor. And 4. If this were practicable ſome good men would practice it, at leaſt this Doctor himſelf: But I never heard of one that pre-examined his Communicants whether they were *ready and willing to be Confirmed.* 5. And if he did, he would keep away many fit Perſons, that ſcruple our ſort of Confirmation. 6. And what is all this to the many thouſand Noncommunicants, who quietly remain members of your Churches?

Sect. 21. As to his words *p.* 275. of power to keep the ſcandalous from the Sacrament, I have in ſo many books proved it next to none, and utterly inſufficient, that I will not waſt time to repeat all here.

Sect. 22. He tells me that in *Can.* 26 is not in *Reformatio Legum Eccleſ. Anſ.* But I have before told him, how much more and better is, which would go far to heal us could we obtain it. He ſaith that [*any one that hath ſeen them knoweth it to be a miſtake*, to ſay *it was publiſhed by John Fox. Anſ.* His Reader muſt be a ſtrong believer, and take much on his word; 1. I have

have seen them, and spake with men of great understanding that have seen them, that yet judge it no mistake. 2. The Preface of the publisher is like his Style. 3. It is called *Prafatio I. F.* And can every Reader know that *I. F.* meaneth not *John Fox?* 4. Ordinary Tradition saith it was *John Fox's*: And what should I sooner believe in such a case? Instead of proving that they have all a power (to their condemnation) which we see they exercise not, let him procure a real power declared and granted, and it will do more than these words.

Sect. 23. But when it comes to the question whether we may so much as call a sinner to repentance by name before the Church, who rejecteth all more private admonition, he puts the question, whether the *obligation to admonish publickly an offender, or to deny him the Sacrament if he will come to it, be so great as to bear him out in the violation of a Law, made by publick authority*, &c. *Ans.* The first question is whether Christ have not made his Church so different a thing from the World, that they should be openly differenced, by a *Communion of* Saints? 2. And whether he hath not instituted an office to judge of this and by Government execute it? And 3. Whether any man have authority to suspend this Law or Office? And then 4. I shall grant that not only Discipline, but Preaching and Prayer and Sacraments may be forborn *hic & nunc* in the present exercise, when else the exercise would do more hurt than good. 5. But are these Laws good that forbid it? and should we *Covenant* never to endeavour an *Alteration*?

Sect. 24. He next tells us of the great difficulty of exercising true Discipline, (which is most true) and seems thence to defend the forbearance of it with us. *Answ.* I have in my Treatise of Episcopacy and oft proved that it is of great importance to Christ's ends, and that he would have it continued to the last, and that the Communion of Saints is a practical Article of Faith; and that making small difference between the Church and the World, tends to Church destruction, and to the reproach of Christianity, and the utter undoing of millions of Souls.

And though Pope and Prelates have abused it to captivate Princes and Nations, the just use of it (he knoweth) is mentioned by the Universal Church, and visibly recorded in the Canons of the several ages. Though some Erastians are of late against it; And Jesuits and worldly Protestants can dispense with it when it would hurt their worldly interest, and turn it chiefly against Gods Servants that displease and cross them.

Sect. 25. *p.* 284. He saith, [*The want of Discipline in the Parish*

Churches

Churches was never thought by old Nonconformists destructive to the being of them.

Answ. They did not confound the *Power* and the *Exercise*: Not what the *Ministers* office is indeed and from God, and what it is by the Bishops Mind and Rules of Conformity. I say as they. 1. The *Exercise* may be suspended without nulling the *Power* or Policy. 2. They are true Pastors and Churches by Gods will, against the will of those that would degrade them.

Sect. 26. But *supposing every man left to his own Conscience, for Communion.* 1. He saith the *greatest Offenders generally excommunicate themselves.*

Answ. 1. And is it your way to leave all the rest to their Consciences, and yet to preach and write against, and lay in Jail dissenting godly People that communicate not with you? 2. And are not all these Offenders still Members of your Church? *Alhasianus* complaineth of their Roman French Church, that he never knew any further cast out than from the Sacrament, and left still to other parts of communion as Members; And so do you by thousands who are all Sons of your Church; but we are none.

He is again at it, *what Church I was of*, and I have told him oft enough.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

What the National Church of England *is?*

Sect. 1. ACcording to the Doctors Method we come now to the Explication of one of the terms of our Controverſie, ſo long and loudly called for, *viz. what the National Church of* England *is, which we muſt obey, and from which we are ſaid to ſeparate, p.* 287. And the anſwer is ſuch as may tell Dr. *Fulwood* and him, that it's time to give over wondering that I underſtood not what they meant by it.

Sect. 2. Our queſtion is of the Church Policy and Political Form. All writers of Politicks difference a meer *Community*, from a *Political Body*: This is eſſentiated of the two conſtitutive Parts, the *Pars Regens* and *Pars ſubdita*: the former is much like the Soul, and the later the Body. The Ruling Part is called the *Form* by moſt, and the ſorts (*Monarchical*, *Ariſtocratical*, *Democratical* or mixt) the *form in Specie*, as the rational or ſenſitive Soul to Animals: But the Relative Form is the *Union* of both in their proper order. Such a body Politick is a Kingdom, a City, a Church in the proper and uſual ſenſe.

But in a looſe ſenſe many other things may be called a Church. As 1. a Community prepared for a governing Form, not yet received. 2. An occaſional Congregation about Religion (as Priſoners that pray together; Men that meet about a Religious Conſultation or Diſpute, *&c.*) 3. Many Churches as under one Chriſtian Magiſtrate as an accidental Head. 4. Many Churches aſſociated for mutual help and concord, without any governing Head: Either of one Kingdom or of many. 5. Many Churches as meerly agreeing in Judgment and Love, in diſtant parts of the World. None of theſe are Churches *in* the political Senſe, but are equivocally ſo called.

But Politically. 1. All the Chriſtian World is one Church as formed by their Relation to Chriſt the Head. 2. All ſingle Churches that have Paſtors to guide them in the Eſſentials of the Paſtoral Office, are true Churches, formed by this mutual Relation. Theſe two are undoubted.

3. The

3. The now *Roman Catholick* Church is one by Usurpation, as informed by one Usurping head.

4. A Patriarchal Church is one, as Governed by a Patriarch.

5. A Provincial Church is one as headed by the Metropolitan, or as mixt where Aristocratically others are joyned with him.

6. An Archiepiscopal or Diocesan Church that hath particular Churches and Bishops under it is one as headed by that Diocesane. (*Jure an injuriâ* I dispute not.)

7. A Diocesane Church of many score or hundred Parishes, having no *Episcopus Gregis*, or true Pastors and Pastoral Churches under him, but only half Pastors and Chappels that are but *partes Ecclesiæ*, is one, even of the lowest sort, in their opinion, as headed by that Diocesane.

8. A Presbyterian Classical Church is one, as headed by the Classes.

9. A Presbyterian National Church is one, as headed by the General Assembly.

10. An Episcopal National Church is one, either as headed by one National Bishop, or else by a Synod of Bishops Aristocratically; or else by a Synod of Bishops and Presbyters Aristocratically. All these that are constituted of *One Regent* and a *Subdite Part*, are called Churches in a Political proper sense, and not only equivocally.

Now the Question is, Of which sort is the *National Church of England?*

And the Doctor saith, *page 287. 1. That, the Society of all Christians is counted a true Catholick Church, from their Union and Consent in some common things: and so is ours, &c.*

Answ. But *in what common things?* Not *in one Bible*, for so may Hereticks, much less in one Liturgy. If it be not a consent in one Governing Head, it makes no proper Church.

2. He supposeth an agreement in the same Faith, and *under the same Government and Discipline.*

Answ. That's right. But what *Government* is it, *Civil*, or *Ecclesiastical?* The first is no essential part of a proper Church. If it be the later, is it *one in specie* or in *individuo politico?* Not the former; for so do Episcopal Churches in several Nations may have one species of Government, as many Kingdoms may have. It is therefore the later that is all my Question, *which is the Church-Head?*

He saith [*As several Families make one Kingdom, so several lesser Churches make one National.*

Answ. True, if that National Church have one Constitutive Head as a Family hath: It's no Family without a *Pater* or *Mater Familias*. And no Governed proper Church without Governours; and there is no Governour where there is no supreme in his place and kind: For inferiours have all their power from the supreme: There is no Universal supreme but God: but the King is subordinately the supreme in his Kingdom in respect to inferiours, and so it is in other Governed Societies.

He addeth [*The name of a Church comprehended the Ecclesiastical Governours and People of whole Cities, and so may be extended to many Cities united under one Civil Government, and the same rules of Religion.*

Answ. 1. If the question were only *de nomine*, we grant that Civil Courts even of Heathens are usually by Writers called *Ecclesiæ*, and so is any Assembly. If this be all you mean, speak out.

2. Many Nations may agree in the same Rules of Religion, yea, so all Christians do: Doth this constitute National Churches?

3. One Civil Government is of another *species*, and not essential but accidental to a Church, and therefore doth not constitute or individuate it: One Justice of Peace or Mayor in a Christian Corporation, doth not make it one Parish Church. But if this be all your meaning, speak out: we grant *de re* a Christian Kingdom, and contend not *de nomine* if you call it a *Church*.

§. 3. *page* 297. 1. As to the difference of a National Church and Kingdom, he granteth what we desire, confessing the difference. But asketh [*whence cometh all this Zeal now against a National Church?*]

Answ. An untrue insinuation.

1. To desire to know what it is, is untruly called *zeal* against it.

2. And agreeing with you in the description is no zeal against it.

He adds [*The Presbyterians and Mr. Hudson write for it.*

Answ. Mr. *Hudson* is a Conformist: And the Presbyterians tell you what they mean, a Christian Nation of particular Churches Governed by One General Assembly as the Supreme Ecclesiastical Government. Whether this be just or unjust is now none of our question. I have oft told what I think of it. Do you also tell us which is your National Church-power and I have done? Are you loth to be understood?

§. 4. But

§. 4. But page 209. He cometh to his plain Answer, viz. 1. [*The National Church of* England *diffusive is the whole Body of Christians in this Nation, consisting of Pastors and People, agreeing in that Faith, Government and worship which are established by the Laws of this Realm.*] And now he [*continues his wonder at those who so confidently say, they cannot tell what we mean by the Church of* England.]

Answ. Yea, your wonder may increase, that I less and less understand it, if you did not after tell us better than in this unhappy definition.

1. Is this called the *Church diffusive* one *Governed body Politick*? If nor, it is no Church in the sense in question, and I'le not stick with you for an equivocal name.

2. Do you mean by [*Government agreed in.* 1. The Civil Government. 2. Or the Ecclesiastical Government of the particular Churches severally. 3. Or one Government of all the National Church?

1. The first makes it no Church in the sense in question.

2. The second makes it no Church, but an Association of many Churches: such as a thousand Independent Churches may make, or the Churches of many Kingdoms. Many Families Associated are no City or one ruled Society if they agree in no Common Governours, but only their several Family Governours. Many Cities associated are no Commonwealth if they agree not in one supreme power. It's no political body without one common Governour, Natural or Collective, Monarchical, Aristocratical or Democratical.

And what is it of [*Worship established by Law*] that individuates your Church? all that the Law hath established.

1. Your Church hath oft changed its very being, and may do at every Parliament.

2. And the Church is small and unknown, if all that differ in any point established are no parts of it. But if it be *as established*, who knoweth by this definition what it is, and what is the very matter of your Church. So that here is a definition which neither nameth matter or form.

§. 5. Next he answereth the Question, *How all the Congregations in* England *make up this one Church?*] and answereth [*By Unity of Consent, as all particular Churches make one Catholick.*]

Answ. Consent to what? 1. If it be not to *one common Government*, it is no Governed Church, as one. 2. Doth he think that the Catholick Church *consenteth* not to one *Governing Head, Christ?* And doth any thing else make them formally *One Politick body or Church?* This were ill Doctrine.

§. 6. Question, *How comes it to be One National Church?* (Saith he) *I say because it was received by the common consent of the whole Nation in Parliament, as other Laws of the Nation are?*]

Answ. Whether, [*How comes it?*] Speak of the *efficient cause*, or *the formal*, or what, it's hard to know, so singular are his Logical notions. But the first is most likely.

And then, 1. The question is still unanswered, *What is the One common Governing power in the Church which this Parliament consent hath set up?* He knows this is the question.

2. And if it be by *Parliament consent, how old is your Church?* What Parliament first made it? It's not so old as *Luther?* Is it no older than the Liturgy or Canons?

3. Doth it die and live again as oft as Parliaments change it? If the corruption of one have been the generation of another, how many Churches of *England* have you had?

4. The whole Nation did not consent by Parliament when the Lords and Commons voted down the Bishops and Liturgy: was there then no National Church?

5. How shall we prove that the whole or half the Nation ever meant to put their consent into the hand of the Parliament to make a new Church of *England*, and to alter it?

6. What men make they may destroy. May not the Nation withdraw such consent? and the Parliament unmake their creature?

§. 7. Next, p. 300 he saith [*The Representative Church of England is the Bishops and Presbyters of this Church meeting according to the Laws of the Realm, to consult and advise about matters of Religion. The consent of both Convocations (of Canterbury and York Province) is the Representative National Church of* England.

Answ. 1. So here we have a *Diffusive Church* and its Representative, but no Government of either, as a Church, mentioned, but the Civil.

2. And they can be no *Governours* exactly as *Representing* those that are no *Governours* themselves. Not as the *peoples Representatives*, for they are no *Church Governours*. (whatever elsewhere he saith like

a

2. Power of the Keys being given to *Peter* as representing the whole Church? Not as the *Presbyters* representatives; For, 1. They are denied Episcopal power, 2. And they are Governours at most but of their particular Churches, and not of the whole. 3. Not as the Bishops representatives, for 1. They are there themselves, 2. And they are no *Common Governours of the whole as such.*

1. If he mean that the two Convocations when they consent become the *One* Common Constitutive Governing Power of the National Church, this is intelligible, but 1. He after denieth any such; 2. And then their dissent would dissolve the Church, and one Convocation not oblige it; (with much more such.)

§. 8. But yet he perceiveth he hath not answered me, and therefore comes to it, *page* 300, saying, [*It's a false supposition that where-ever there is the true notion of a Church, there must be a Constitutive Regent part,* ——— *a standing Governing power which is an essential part of it.*]

Answ. A *true notion*, belongeth to equivocals: The *true notion*, and the proper *political notion* are words of various signification. I have granted you that the *true notion* of a Church belongs to a Ship full, a Prison full, a House full, of Christians as such; and to our Parliament, and to the Common Council of the City: But not the notion now in question.

2. Is not Government essential to a Governed Church? Fixed Government to a fixed Church, and transient temporary Government to an answerable Church? Deny this and few will follow you.

§. 9. He adds, ["Which I will prove to be false from Mr. B. "himself. He asserts that there is one Catholick visible Church, "and that all particular Churches headed by their particular Bi-"shops or Pastors, are parts of the Universal Church as a Troop is of "an Army, and a City of a Kingdom. ... Then it will unavoidably "follow, that there must be a Catholick visible Head to a Catho-"lick visible Church. And so Mr. B. Constitutive Regent part of "a Church hath done the Pope a wonderful kindness —— But there "are some men in the world that do not attend the advantages "they give to Popery, so they may but vent their spleen against "the Church of *England*. But does not Mr. B. say, that the Uni-"versal Church is headed by Christ; I grant he doth: But the "Constituends of the Visible Church of which particular Churches

"are

"are parts: And they being Visible parts, require a Visible Constitutive Regent Head,——therefore the whole Visible Church "must have likewise a Constitutive Visible Regent part — This is to "make a Key for Catholicks?

Answ. I am glad he speaketh so intelligibly, in denying a *Constitutive Regent part*; though sorry that he speaks so ill.

1. When I have written against *Johnson, alias Terry* the Papist, two Books on this subject; especially the later fully proving the Catholick Church headed by Christ, to be that visible Church Catholick of which all particulars are members; Can the Reader think I should write it over again, because this Doctor will talk over a little of the same with that Priest, and take no notice of my proof or answer?

2. Doth he believe that the Kingdoms of the World are not visible parts of God's Universal Kingdom? and yet God invisible?

3. Dare he say that all true Churches are not real parts of Christ's Universal Church, as a Governed body? and yet are not they visible? Is it necessary then that the Universal Head must be visible if the subordinate be so?

4. Doth he not perceive that he turneth the Controversie, from the *necessity* of a *Regent head*, to the necessity of his visibility? As if our question had not been, *Which is the Regent part of the Church of* England? *but whether it must be visible?* Is this edifying?

5. All Christians are agreed that the Universal Church is Visible. 1. In its parts and members on earth, and their profession. 2. In that Christ the Head was visible on earth; 3. And hath left Visible Universal Laws; 4. And hath a Body visible in Heaven, as the King is to his Courtiers but not to most of his Subjects; 5. And will shortly visibly judge all the World. Thus far and no further (save as seen extraordinarily to *Paul, Stephen*, &c.) is the Universal Head Visible. And are we not agreed that this is a real and most excellent Political Church? and that all other Visible Churches are parts of it? Something besides spleen makes some men talk dangerously.——

6. But really doth he think that this doth unavoidably set up the Pope? Why, first is there a word of this that a sober Christian dare deny? or that the Christian World doth not commonly consent to? And do the certain Doctrines of the Gospel and Church set up the Pope? Will he turn Papist if this be granted,

and

and the Christian World be not deceived? Is this our Champion against Popery now? I thought no man but Mr. *Cheny* and some odd Papists had been of this Opinion? But to Mr. *Cheny* and against *Johnson* I have confuted it, and therefore thither refer the Reader. Far be it from me to resist Popery by denying, 1. That Christ's Church thus far visible is one Political body headed by himself, 2. Or that all true visible Churches are parts of it. 3. Or that every Political Governed body is constituted of the *Regent and subdite parts*. Christians will reject me for the former, and Politicians deride me if I hold the last.

§. 11. He proceedeth, [" 2. The plain resolution is, that we " deny any necessity of any such Regent Constitutive part, or one " formal Ecclesiastical Head as essential to a National Church: For a " National consent is as sufficient to make a National Church as an " Universal consent to make a Catholick.]

Answ. No consent maketh a Catholick Church, but consenting to one supreme Head, Christ: But I am glad I understand you.

§ 12. Saith he, [" Quest. By what way this National consent " is to be declared? By the Constitutions of this Church the Arch- " Bishops, Bishops and Presbyters summoned by the King's Writ, " are to advise and declare their judgments in matters of Religion, " which received and enacted by Parliament there is as great a Na- " tional consent as to any Law. And all the Bishops, Ministers and " People make up this National Church.]

Answ. Now we are come to the bottom: And, 1. Our question is of the *Constitution* of the Church, and the Doctor tells us the *Administration* makes it. To *consult and advise and make Laws* are acts of *Administration*, and follow the *Constitution*. Men must *have Power* before they *use it*, and must *be a Church* before they *act as Church*.

2. Yea to *Advise* and *Consult* are not so much as acts proper to administring Government, but belong to those that are no Governours also.

3. If they be no Laws till the Parliament make them such, then either the Parliament are your Church Head, or you have none that's Ecclesiastical.

But having your plain Confession that you have no such *Regent part*, and so are *no Church Political*, (save Civil) but a meer Association, I ask

§ 3.

§. 13. 1. Why do you pretend that *we are none of the Church* of *England*, or that we vent our ſpleen againſt it or deny it, who deny not Aſſociated Churches in *England* under one Civil Government?

2. How unhappily are the Church-Defenders and Conformiſts diſagreed? Read Mr. *Dodwel* and many ſuch others that take the Church to be a *Governed body Politick*, and ſee what they will judg of you?

3. Are not you and I liker to be of one Church of *England*, who agree *what it is*, than *you and theſe Biſhops and Doctors* that ſpeak of two different things, and agree not ſo much *as what it is?*

4. Have you not brought your Defence of the Church of *England* to a fair iſſue, by denying that there is any ſuch Church, in the queſtioned political ſenſe?

5. What made you before talk of being under *one Government?* If you meant only Civil? Is your Governed Church as ſuch only Civil, or a Kingdom only?

6. Do you not now abſolve all men from the duty of *obeying the Church of* England *as ſuch*, and from all guilt of diſobeying them? How can men Govern that are no Governours? and how can we obey them? It's only the Civil power then that we herein diſobey.

If you ſay that all the Biſhops are Governours, and altogether govern the whole; I anſwer, Yes *per partes*, but not as *a whole or Church*. If twenty Families in a Village agree as Maſters and Servants, to go one way as Conſenters, this maketh no one Government of the Village. If the Phyſicians of *London* conſent to one Pharmacopeia that maketh them not a body Politick. If twenty Sea Captains conſent to go one Voyage by one rule, each one is a Governour of his own ſhip, but this maketh no Government of the whole. All the Juſtices and Mayors of *England* rule the Kingdom *per partes*, by the ſame Law: But all together make not one Ariſtocracy to Govern the Kingdom as One whole. Unleſs your Biſhops, &c. are United in One *perſona Politica* or *Ariſtocracy*, they may rule their ſeveral Churches, but they make not one common Government for the National Church as ſuch. An agreement of the Emperour, *Spaniards*, and other Confederates make not one Kingdom or body Politick.

7. How

7. How can they be Schismaticks for disobeying them that are not their Governours.

8. How come Dissenters bound by *Parliament consent?* If it never was in their minds to trust them as Consenters for them? yea and declare their own dissent, as most of the Nation did lately against Prelacy and Liturgy, yea and their chosen representatives? Have such representatives more power to express our consent than we our selves?

9. You unhappily erre with *Hooker* in your popular Politicks, if you think that the Laws bind us only because we consent to them by our Representatives, or that as such they make them. Whereas it is as by *Consenting in the Constitution they are made part of the Rulers or Legislators*, and not meerly as if *we made the Laws by them.*

10. And as to Convocation consent, how binds it all those that never consented to them? How is the City of *London* so bound to Conform, when they had not one chosen Clerk (but only the Dignitaries) in the Convocation that made us our Conformity (the two chosen by them being refused by the Bishops.)

11. Will not you pass for an asserter of the Principles of Independency, that not only say, The Keys are given to the whole body, and the Convocation represent the People, &c. but also that *England* is one Church but by consent, without consenting to any one Constitutive Regent Church head. The *Independents* are for a National Church meerly by confederacy and consent, without National Government of it.

12. You go further from the Episcopal Politicks than the Presbyterians do: For they make an *Aristocratical Regent Part*, but you make none.

13. I doubt some Statesmen will be angry with you, that say there is no power of Church Government in *England*, but from the King as Head (as *Crompton* before *Cousins* Tables, and others ordinarily.)

14. Do you make *England* in essentials any more one Church, than *England* and any Foreigners agreeing are one? Did the Synod of *Dort* make us one with them? Do large Councils make many Nations one Church? Did the Heptarchy make *England* one Kingdom, when seven Kings Governed the whole by *parts*, but none the whole, as such?

15. I beſeech you think what you have done againſt the *Parochial, Dioceſane* and *Provincial Churches* in *England*. Have none of theſe, have not each of theſe a *Regent Conſtitutive part?* Are none of them true Churches in *ſenſu politico?* You dare not ſay, No. If they are, You have ſaid *that viſible Churches as Parts unavoidably require a viſible Head to the whole* (by which I bring in the Pope, becauſe you think Chriſt will not ſerve the turn:) And do you not ſay that all theſe Churches are parts of the Church of *England?* And if you deny it to have one *Regent part*, do you not then either deſtroy the reſt, or uſe the name *Church* equivocally to theſe ſeveral ſorts ſo heterogeneal?

16. I pray you tell us, from whom our Arch-biſhops receive their power? If you ſay from the Biſhops, and ſo Inferiours or Equals may give power, why may not Presbyters make Presbyters or Biſhops, and *generare ſpeciem?* If it muſt come from Superiours, the *Church* of *England* hath none ſuch.

17. If the Peoples conſent can make a National Church, why may it not make an Independant or Presbyterian Church?

18. If the Nations conſent, as ſuch make the Church of *England*, it is not made by Legiſlative power of King and Parliament.

19. Do the Clergy repreſent the King? or is he none of the Church?

20. How prove you that the Clergy repreſent the Laity in the Convocation?

21. By your Rule, if divers parties of Chriſtians agree to ſet up divers forms of Church-Government, with mutual forbearance they would be one National Church. And ſo would Epiſcopal, Presbyterians and Independants if the Law allowed them all.

22. Was the *Church* of *England* the ſame thing in the days of *H. 8. Ed. 6. Q. Mary, Q. Eliz. &c.*

23. Who maketh *National Churches* in abſolute Hereditary Monarchies, where are no Parliaments to ſignifie popular conſent?

24. If every Law of Order be eſſential to your Church, few Conformiſts are of it: If only the true eſſentials, why are not we alſo of it?

25. How ill agree you with Mr. *Chevy*, who maketh it Atheiſm, Infidelity, Blaſphemy, Impiety, to aſſert Church-making conſent or confederacies beſides Baptiſm?

26. But

26. But the best is you leave us in hope of Reformation; for if Parliaments will but consent for us to take down Dioceſanes lower, and to reform Pariſh-Churches, and alter Liturgy, &c. we are the *National Church* ſtill. And one prevailing Vote may prove us all conſenters; and make the Church quite another thing.

§. 14. Yet he ſaith [*Page* 299. *By this deſcription any one may ſee how eaſily the Church of* England *is diſtinguiſhed from the Papiſts on one ſide, and the Diſſenters on the other.*]

Anſw. I am one, and I cannot ſee it, nor ſo much as ſee how to know the *Church* it ſelf, nor who is a Member of it, nor how any man can know it: but he ſeems to me to make it a *Church inviſible*. But I ſee the Diſſenters muſt be none of it.

1. How was the *Church* of *England* known from Papiſts, in the beginning of *H.*8. or in the middle, or in the end? or how known when it began?

How was it known in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeths* days, when the *Papiſts* came to *Church*? or now as to *Church-Papiſts*? How ſhall we know to which *Church* the late Biſhop *Bramhall* and other Doctors belong, who would have the Pope Govern us according to the *Canons* as Patriarch of the *Weſt*, *& principium unitatis univerſalis*, and all go for Schiſmaticks that deny it. Some call this the *New-Church* of *England*, differing from the old one which was before Biſhop *Laud*.

2. How ſhall one know how far conſent is neceſſary to a Member, and diſſent unchurcheth him? Lately a Doctor was accuſed for ſaying he ſcrupled to call the King according to the Liturgy, *Our moſt Religious King*: Mr. *Yole* of *Sarral* was ſuſpended for not oftner wearing the Surplice, and denying to pray in the Litany for [*Our moſt Gracious Queen* Katherine, *and* James *Duke of* York. But theſe are ſmall diſſents; The ſenſe is the Churches Law and Doctrine, and not the ſound of words in various ſenſes: I have oft ſhewed in how many contrary ſenſes the *Conformiſts* take the 39 Articles, the Liturgy, the words of Subſcription and Declaration, and the Oaths impoſed? How ſhall one know among all theſe, who are, or are not of your *Church*? When you tell us that it is [*Agreeing in the Faith, Government and Worſhip which is eſtabliſhed by Law*] and then ſpeak ſo hotly againſt the need and being of any common Government, ſave the Civil, at all eſtabliſhed over the *Church* as a *National body*, and never diſtinguiſh any neceſſary parts of *Faith*, *Government* and *Worſhip*,

from the reſt, nor tell us how to know them? And when Conformiſts diſſent in ſo many things; ſome from Lay Chancellours Government by the Keys, ſome in the ſenſe of the Articles, and the Nonconformiſts ſay they conſent to all that Scripture requireth, and the meer Circumſtantials determined by Law, how ſhall you be known? Either it is in the Eſſentials only, or the Integrals alſo, or alſo in all the Laws *de Accedentibus*, that the Church of *England* by agreement is made that *One Church*.

1. If it be only in *Eſſentials*, is there either Confeſſion, Rubrick, Canon, or any Writer that hath told us *which be, thoſe*, and *all thoſe*, and only thoſe Eſſentials? I never met with man that pretendeth to know them, and therefore never met with man that can thus tell, whether he be of the Church of *England* or not? nor that can tell of others, and who is not?

2. To ſay it muſt be conſent alſo in the Integrals that is neceſſary *ad eſſe*, is a contradiction: and is to make Integrals Eſſentials. To ſay that it muſt be conſent in all Laws of *Accidents* alſo, is to make that an eſſential part which is no part. Our looſe confounding Diſputers, when they have loſt the truth in ſuch contradictions, may ſay as Mr. *Dodwell* doth to me, that I Cavil: But will that anſwer help down all abſurdities with reaſonable men? It's plain that as the Papiſts Doctrine of defining Church-Members and Chriſtians, by no Eſſential Articles of Faith, but by *Probable Propoſal* of more or leſs doth make their Church inviſible, ſo doth this definition of the Church of *England* by Doctor *Stillingfleet* make theirs, and leave us uncertain who is of it. It makes me think what I hear *Oliver* the Uſurper ſaid to a Biſhop that now is (as I am credibly told, [*Doctor how know you that you are a true Miniſter of Chriſt?*] who anſwered him on Mr. *Dodwell*'s Principles, [*Becauſe I have received Ordination by uninterrupted ſucceſſive conveyance from true Biſhops, from the Apoſtles:*] Saith he; *Are you ſure they were all true Biſhops and the ſucceſſion uninterrupted? Doctor will you take your Oath that you are thus a true Miniſter?*] At which when he ſtuck, [*Come, come, Doctor*, ſaith he, *there is a ſurer and a nearer way.*]

Certain I am, that if Agreement in the ſenſe of the 39 Articles, or in all Forms and Ceremonies be neceſſary to conſtitute a Member of the Church of *England*, abundance that ſubſcribe are none, that now go for ſuch: But if not, I pray tell us why ſuch as I alſo are not Members of your Church. Do I more differ from you than

Doctor

Doctor *Heylin*, Mr. *Thorndike*, Mr. *Dodwell*, and in a word that the party which adhered to Arch-biſhop *Laud*, differed from the party which adhered to Biſhop *Abbot*, *Whitgift*, and the Parliaments of thoſe and after-times? If the Church of *England* as ſuch a one, be conſtituted by no ſupreme Church-Government, we are all of it, ſo far as we conſent to the Aſſociation, and none as it is one Political body. And what then becomes of its Laws, and all the Treatiſes of its Church-Policy?

§. 15. But yet the Doctor ſtops not here: *I unavoidably introduce Popery if I make a Conſtitutive Regent Church power, neceſſary to a Church: for then the Univerſal Church muſt have ſuch.*]

Anſw. 1. It's not neceſſary to an equivocal ungoverned Church, ſuch as our *Worceſterſhire* Aſſociation made: But to a Political Governed Church it is.

2. Mark here all you that go the Political Church way, that your Doctor accuſeth you more than the Nonconformiſts, even of certain opening the door to Popery. What if I had ſaid ſo by you? Is it ſuch men that thus make you agents for a Pope?

3. Doth this Political deſcription of Parochial, Dioceſane, Provincial, Patriarchal Churches, alſo bring in Popery?

4. Then either our Archbiſhops have no power, or they have it from no ſuperiour, or elſe they infer a Pope.

5. I again tell the Doctor as I did Mr. *Cheny*; It is diſingenious to ſay this to me, when I have written ſo much againſt *Johnſon* the Prieſt, in my firſt, and ſpecially my ſecond anſwer, which none replyeth to, without any confutation or notice of it: I have fully proved that Chriſt's Catholick Church hath himſelf for an Eſſential Head, ſometime viſible on earth, leaving viſible Laws, and now viſible to the Courtiers in Heaven, and coming viſibly to judge all; and there is no other. Indeed if the doctrine of Mr. *Dodwell* and many ſuch hold, who deny that the power floweth immediately from Chriſts Law or Charter to the Church, and not from the Ordainers or Electors, who do but *determine of the Receiver and Inveſt him*, then all the Doctors in *England* cannot anſwer the Digreſſion, *Cap.* 14. of the Book called [*The Catholick Hierarchy*,] proving that ſuch a Prelatical ſubordination of Churches, infereth a Pope: But I have fully ſhewed the vanity of that inference as to us.

But remember that the Doctor and I are agreed, that [*A Nation conſenting* in an Aſſociation of particular Churches, may be called a Na-

a National Church (equivocally,) Though it can make no Laws unless its consent also set up a Supreme Church-Government. Meer Agreements are not Laws.

§. 16. He next would make the unwary Reader think that he answereth my Question, 1. *What is the same Rule that all must walk by, viz. that the Scriptures are the Foundation of our Faith.* ——— 2. *But our Church requireth Conformity to the Rules appointed by it agreeable to the word of God.*]

Answ. But it seems the Scripture then is not the whole rule, but part: the fundamental part. 2. Which did *Paul* mean? Was your Churches Rule then made? 3. Doth your Church require this *ad esse*, or but *ad melius esse*? If the first, all Canon-breakers are dismembred? And, is that according to God's word? If the later, why am not I of your Church? 4. But how comes that Church to command and bind, which hath no such Ruling power?

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Peoples Consent to the Pastoral and Church-Relation.

§. 1. PAge 307. Saith the Dean, ["The next thing to be con-"sidered is the interest and power of the People as to "the choice of their Pastors, for want of which great complaints "are made, —— Mr. *Baxter* is very tragical on this Argument, "and keepeth not within tolerable bounds of discretion in plead-"ing the Peoples Cause against Magistrates and Patrons and "Laws.]

Answ. 1. That is tolerable to some men, which others cannot bear; Silken ears must have soft words; *The Land cannot bear all his words*, was an old Complaint: And [*Speak pleasing things, Prophecy deceit*] was an old Mandate. It's no wonder if that sort of men, that must judg whether our Preaching, and Worshipping God be tolerable, and must write us down the words which we must say to God in Prayer, or not be tolerated, do also think themselves the meet judges, whether our *indiscretion be intolerable*.

2. But let us try whether he state this Controversie any more Logically or truly than the rest, and whether he intimate not hurtful though tollerable untruth.

1. It's a crooked insinuation, to put the word [*Power*] instead of [*Right and Liberty*,] as if [*Power*] of Consenting in the People, and [*Power of Rulers*] were univocal and not equivocal terms: But this is tolerable: For experience hath convinced me, how little Logical strictness is from this Doctor to be expected: I doubt lest next, as some men instead of Learning maintain their reputation by deriding it, we may expect some such defence of the Doctors Logick, to prove that he is none of the *Disputers of this World*, who *deceive men by vain Philosophy*.

2. And the word [*choice*] instead of [*consent*] is somewhat more crooked: For [*choice*] usually includeth the first nominating

Vote;

Vote; And he knoweth that I pleaded for the neceſſity of no more, than the *Churches conſent*, though it were ſubſequent to the choice of Magiſtrates or Patrons.

3. But the next is worſe, that [*I plead the Peoples Cauſe againſt Magiſtrates, Patrons and Laws,*] when I do but deſire their Conjunction.

§. 2. His repetitions call me tediouſly to repeat the ſtate of the Controverſie (a buſineſs quite below him.)

1. I Have oft ſaid, that God hath not made either *Magiſtrates* or *People* the Judges who is fit to be, and ſhall be a Miniſter of Chriſt in general; but the ORDAINERS and the PERSON himſelf conjunct. This is evident, 1. From Scripture Inſtances of all that were Ordained: 2. From the nature of the thing.

1. Who is ſuppoſed ſo fit to judge as men and Seniors of the ſame Office? Who but Phyſicians are fit to judge who is meet to be a Licenſed Phyſician? And who but Philoſophers judge of Graduates and Profeſſours in Philoſophy?

2. And no man can make me a Miniſter againſt my will, nor know me to be fit, if I know my ſelf to be unfit.

§. 3. II. I have oft ſaid that the Supreme Civil Governour is the Judge, *whom he muſt countenance, maintain and tolerate.* The proof is eaſie, 1. Becauſe *to do it* is *his* work; and every man muſt be a diſcerning judge of his own work. 2. Becauſe it is a publick act of Government, and he is the chief publick Judge therein.

§. 4. III. I have oft ſaid that the Diſpoſal of the Tythes and Temples is in the power of the Prince, and Patron by his grant. But with theſe bounds.

1. His power is not *Abſolute*, but *Under Chriſt* and limited by him, and therefore he hath no power againſt him, nor to croſs his Laws or to contradict his ends.

2. If the Tythes and Temples were given only for publick Teachers of Catechumens, or for meer Lecturers, the Magiſtrate muſt diſpoſe of them to ſuch as are capable of that Office.

3. If the Tythes and Temples were given for the Paſtors of the Churches, the Magiſtrate is bound to give them to ſuch as are lawfully called to be ſuch Paſtors, and not by the advantage of his Truſt, overthrow the way of entrance inſtituted by Chriſt.

4. How-

4. However if they were devoted to God, it is God who is the proprietor, and it's sacrilege to alienate them. And an intolerable ill disposal is alienation.

§. 5. IV. I have oft said, that it being supposed that their Ancestors gift of Tythes or Glebe and Temples is the reason of our common *Patronage* and presenting power, the will of the dead Donors is to be observed, and their gifts given to none but on the termes by them determined: But their gifts are supposed to be for the Churches good and not against it: Nor had they any power on pretense of benefitence, to destroy, or to take away more than they give: But the Trusting of our Souls Conduct is a matter of more weight than Tythes and Temples. If Tythes be proved not to be of Divine Right, all that can be expected is, that if the flock cannot trust him whom the Patron chuseth, they let him give his Tythes and Temple to whom he please, and they will trust their souls with such as they dare, and safely may. But if he will chuse and offer them one whom they can safely and comfortably accept, so as Tythes and Temples shall preponderate in case of small difference in the men, prudence obligeth them to accept of the advantage. The same I say of the Magistrates countenance and approbation. But if the difference be very great, it's better stretch our purses to build new Temples and pay our Pastors than trust our souls on the Pastoral Conduct of ignorant, malignant, unfaithful or heretical men.

§. 6. V. I have oft said, that *mutual consent* is necessary to the being of the relation of *Pastor* and *Flock*. And though sometimes the Rulers imposition, and the Patrons choice, may make it the Peoples duty in prudence to *consent*, when the good preponderates the hurt, (not else) yet *till they consent*, the *Relation* is not *existent*. As if Children were bound to take Wives and Husbands by the Command and fore choice of Parents, yet it's *no Marriage* till they consent.

§. 7. The common objection is from the inconvenience, if the several *parties agree not*: To which I answer.

1. The mischief of the contrary way, is worse than that inconvenience.

2. There is nothing in this World without inconveniences where all things and persons and actions are imperfect.

3. If Parents and Children agree not about their Marriage, it hath great inconveniences; And yet neither *Parents Government*, nor *Childrens consenting Liberty* must be denyed.

4. In so weighty a Case, divers Locks and Keys keep the Churches treasure safe. Prince, Patron, People and Ordainers, will not so often agree on a vile person, as any one of them alone may do.

§. 8. And now judge how Logically, how honestly the Doctor hath stated the Case, and made me *Intolerably indiscreet and tragical against Magistrates, Patrons and Laws.* And try if you can understand what it is instead of this, that he would have: I tell him again, that *if he deny the necessity of the flocks consent to the mutual relation*, he notoriously opposeth the judgment and practice of Antiquity and the Universal Church, of Princes, Patriarchs, Prelates, Councils and People, and fights against the full stream of Historical evidence, for a new crooked way, that would make as many modes of Religion as there are different Princes.

And here he wonders what he said, that occasioned *such undecent passion.* It seems he felt some passion in reading it, and thought he must have the like that wrote it. And so let any man obtrude any pernicious thing on the Church, and he can easily prove the detector to have *undecent passion*, for giving a bad Cause its proper name.

§. 9. But he cannot find out the reason of my inference, that then *Princes may impose what Religion they please.*]

Answ. Not understanding, with some men, goes for confuting: To put [*Religion*] for the *mode of Religion* is too little a slip of his to be insisted on. But is not my inference necessary? I urged him to tell me, in what Countries, and under what sort of Princes the Rule holds, that the People must not judge whether the offered Pastors be Hereticks, nor refuse them, if Prince and Patron present them? He will not be entreated to tell me. I tell him, that if the Rule be universal, when a Papist, Socinian, Anabaptist, Antiepiscopal, &c. Prince and Patron present men of their own mind, and they are instituted, the People must take and trust them as their Pastors: And is not this to set up in all the Churches what modish Religion Prince and Patron please? Is this hard to be understood?

Yet.

Yet he calls this *Railing on him for suppositions of my own making*. And here he steps over to another man.

§. 10. Before I come to his undertakings, I will repeat another's *railing and undecent passion* against his Cause; And I desire the Reader to note how well the Doctors of the Church of *England* agree; and to learn which of them it is that we must believe, both as to History and Right. It is Mr. *Herbert Thorndike* in his Treatise of *Forbearance of Penal.* ["It is to no purpose to talk of Reformation in the Church, to regular Government, without restoring "the Liberty of chusing Bishops and the priviledge of enjoying "them, to the Synods, Clergy and People of each Dioceſs. So evident "is the right of Synods, Clergy and People in the making of those "of whom they consist, and by whom they are to be Governed, "that I need make no other reason of the neglect of Episcopacy, "than the neglect of it.]

Yet these two are Doctors of one Church, but we are no Members of it.

§. 11. I again say that either the Reader hath read the Church History and Canons, or not? If not, how can he tell who to believe that report them? the Doctor or me? But if he have, I will no more dispute this Case with him, than I would do whether *English* Parliaments used to make Laws. He is past my conviction if he be not convinced.

§. 12. And I will again say, that I will yet suppose the Doctor so humble as to acknowledge himself much inferiour to *Paulus Sarpi servita venetus*, in point of Church History: At least I say to the Reader, peruse what he hath said of this Controversie and of the alteration of Church Government in his History of the Council of *Trent*, and his Book of Church Benefices, lately translated by Dr. *Dratton*, and doubt if you can.

§. 13. And in general I add: 1. I suppose no man of such reading maketh any doubt of the first 300 years, whether any Bishops were made over any Church without the free Election or Consent of the Flocks and the whole Clergy, and the approbation of the Ordainers. I will not for shame stay to prove this, having said so much

much of it in my first *Plea for Peace*, and *Episcopal Church History*, which are unanswered.

II. And since the first 300 years, it's so notorious in History that it's a shame to need proof of it, that the Christian Emperours confirmed the Churches in this right and use, and for many hundred years after, permitted and ordered, that Bishops should be chosen by the People, Clergy and Synods, and when the Peoples Election was infringed, the necessity of their consent long continued: And it was only in the choice of the five Patriarchs that the Emperours used to meddle, and that not always, nor at all chusing them alone, but commending some one to the People and Clergy to chuse, or confirming some one that they had nominated. And this held on till Popery sprung up.

III. And even then the Popes long continued it: But, 1. They strove (specially in *Hildebrand's* days and after) against the Emperours negative voice in the confirmation of Popes, 2. And his negative in Investing Bishops: But even in this strife, the Election was confest to be in the Clergy, the People chusing or freely consenting, and no man to be made their Bishop against their will; and it was but the Investiture *per baculum & annulum*, as a confirmation which the Emperours claimed.

§. 14. I have formerly named elder Testimonies not denied: I will now recite but some Canons of Councils.

1. The 9th and 10th Canons of the first great *Nicene* Council nullifieth the very Ordination of scandalous uncapable men: And in the *Arab. Can.* 4. *Si populo placebit*, is made a condition of the Episcopal relation. And *c.* 5. in case of the Peoples disagreement, the said People must take the most blameless.

2. The *Roman* Council said to be under *Silvester* of 275 Bishops saith, [*No Bishop shall Ordain any Clerke, nisi cum omni adunatâ Ecclesiâ*, but with all the Church united. If this Council be not certain, the very forgers shew the Antiquity of the Churches right and custom.

3. I before named a Council at *Capua* that decreed that the two Bishops at *Antioch* chosen by their two Churches, should live in Love and Peace.

4. *Chrysostom's* Church of *Ioannites* would rather separate than forsake their chosen Bishop or his honour, though Emperour, Council and Patriarch

Patriarch was againſt him: and though *Cyril Alex.* wrote that their breach of Canons was intolerable, and to tolerate them (a few ſtubborn Nonconformiſts) would but diſcourage the obedient.

5. Even the famous Pope *Celeſtine* who helpt *Auſtin* againſt the *Pelagians* Decreed [*Let no man be given a Biſhop to the unwilling: Let the ſenſe and deſire of the Clergy, the Laity, and Magiſtracy (ordinis) be required* (or neceſſary.)]

6. How the people depoſed *Theodoſius* Biſhop of *Synada* and choſe another and the change approved, I have elſewhere ſhewed.

7. After *Atticus* death the Clergy at *Conſtantinople* were for *Philip* or *Proclus*, but the people choſe *Siſinnius*, and prevailed.

8. *Siſinnius* ſent *Proclus* to be Biſhop at *Cyzicum*, but the people refuſed him and choſe another.

9. The *Orleance* Council, *an.* 540. *Can.* 3. decreeth about *Ordaining Biſhops, Qui præponendus eſt omnibus ab omnibus eligatur*: as of old, *viz. Let him be choſen by all, who is to be ſet over all.*

10. *An.* 541. The *Concil. Avern.* decree *c.* 2. *That none ſeek the ſacred Office of a Biſhop by Votes but by merit, nor ſeem to get a Divine Office*, rebus ſed moribus: *and that he aſcend to the top of that eminent dignity by the election of all, and not by the favour of a few: and that in chuſing Prieſts there be the greateſt care, becauſe, &c.*

Therefore another Council at *Orleance* decreed that a Biſhop muſt be ordained in his own Church which he muſt overſee.

11. Another *Orleance* Council decree, *c.* 10 *That none get a Biſhoprick by gifts or ſeeking, but with the will of the King, by the election of the Clergy and the Lay-people.* And Can. 11. *And as the ancient Canons have decreed, Let none be made Biſhop to an unwilling People (or without the Peoples conſent) Nor let the People or the Clergy be inclined to conſent, by the oppreſſion of perſons in power (a thing not lawful to be ſpoken.) But if it be otherwiſe done, let the Biſhop be for ever depoſed, &c.*

12. I have formerly cited Pope *Gregory* I. his expreſs Decrees herein.

13. *Clodovens* his Council at *Cabilone* renewed the old Decree, *That all Ordination of Biſhops be null, which was otherwiſe made than by the election of the Com-Provincials, the Clergy and the Citizens.*

14. The General Council called *Quinſextum*, *an.* 692. decreed *Can.* 22. *That Biſhops and Prieſts Ordained with Money, and not by Examination and Election, be depoſed*: Though the ſame Council by humane wiſdom decreed, Can. 38. *That whatſoever alteration the Imperial power ſhall make in any City, the Eccleſiaſtical Order alſo follow it.* The way by

which Humane Order overthrew Divine Order and Inſtitutions.

15. And by the way you may conjecture of the Chuſers by the Council of *Toletane*, *an.* 693. under King *Egica*, where the King Preaching to the Biſhops (as was then needful) decreeth, *That every Pariſh that hath twelve Families have their proper Governour. But if it have leſs than twelve, it ſhall be part of another's charge.*

16. K. *Pepin* (who advanced the Pope to advance himſelf, and added the Sword to Excommunication by miſchievous decree, yet) altered not the common way of Election, and decreeth that every City (like our Corporations) have a Biſhop, and none meddle in another's Dioceſs without his conſent.

17. The choice of Pope *Conſtantine*, the humiliation of *Stephen*, and many ſuch inſtances ſhew that even at *Rome* ſtill the People had the greateſt hand in chuſing the Pope; and that to Communicate with a Biſhop irregularly choſen, was taken for a great ſin. And when *Charles Mag.* was gratified as to the Papal Chair, it was but by making him a neceſſary Confirmer.

18. The *French* Conſtitutions, *l.* 1. *c.* 84. objected about this by *Baronius* and *Binius*, ſay, *Not being ignorant of the ſacred Canons, we conſented to the Eccleſiaſtick Orders, to wit, that Biſhops be choſen by the Election of the Clergy and People, according to the Statutes of the Canons, out of their own Dioceſs, without reſpect of perſons or rewards, for the merit of their life [illegible] very way profi[illegible]*

19. [illegible] *Magn.* [illegible] guilty o[illegible] *obtaineth* [illegible] *That no* [illegible] *A Biſhop* [illegible] *Commun* [illegible] *nor abo*[illegible] (by oppoſers [illegible] *but by many.*

IRREGULAR PAGINATION

And Can. 94. *The people converted from Hereſie by another Biſhop, may be of his flock, without removing their Pariſh dwelling where another is Biſhop.*

Amongſt the other 80 Canons againſt oppreſſion, as one is, *That no Biſhop judge any Prieſt without the preſence of his Clergy, it being void if not ſo confirmed*; So another is againſt all foreign Judgment, *becauſe*

men

men must be judged by those that are chosen by themselves and not by strangers. And none of the Clergy must be condemned till lawful Accusers be present, and the Accused answer the Charge.

20. The second General Council at *Nice*, though by servility they were for Images, held to the old Church-Canons for Elections, saying *Can.* 3. 'Every Election of a Bishop, Priest or Deacon, which is 'made by Magistrates, shall remain void, by the Canon which saith, 'If any Bishop use the secular Magistrates, to obtain by them a Church, 'let him be deposed and separated, and all that Communicate with 'him.

How much more say these than my [*intolerable indiscretion?*] I fear some will think that all this binds them to more separation than I am for.

The 15 Can. forbids them to have two Churches.

Can. 4. condemneth those to *Lex talionis*, as unsufferably mad, that faultily drive any from the Ministry, and segregate them from the Clergy, or shut up the Temples, forbidding God's worship.

21. By the way, a Council at *Chalons* under *Charles Magn.* finding some Prelates setting on foot an Oath of Obedience to them, thus condemn it:

'It is reported of some Brethren (Bishops) that they force them 'that they are about to Ordain, to swear that they are worthy, and 'will not do contrary to the Canons, and will be obedient to the Bi-'shop that Ordaineth them, and to the Church in which they are Or-'dained; which Oath, because it is very dangerous, we all ordain 'shall be forbidden;] which other Councils after repeat, (yet our Bishops rest much on such an Oath of obedience to them.)

22. What the Electing Churches were may be partly conjectured from the *Concil. Regiaticin.* in *Canisius*, Can. 6. *That the Arch-Presbyters examine every Master of a Family particularly, and take account of their Families and lives, &c.*

A Council at *Soisons* about 852. (a Presbyter by the King's Command being Ordained to the Church of *Rhemes* irregularly) Decree, *That they that are made Presbyters without examination by ignorance, or by dissimulation of the Ordainers, when they are known shall be deposed, because the* Catholick Church *defendeth that which is irreprehensible, &c.*

23. *An.* 855. under *Lotharius Remigius Lugd.* and others, at a Council decreed, (because that bad King had by imposing corrupted the Clergy) 'That because Bishops were set over the Cities that were un-'tryed, and almost ignorant of Letters, and unlike the Apostolick pre-

which Humane Order overthrew Divine Order and Inſtitutions.

15. And by the way you may conjecture of the Chuſers by the Council of *Toletane*, *an.* 693. under King *Egica*, where the King Preaching to the Biſhops (as was then needful) decreeth, *That every Pariſh that hath twelve Families have their proper Governour. But if it have leſs than twelve, it ſhall be part of another's charge.*

16. K. *Pepin* (who advanced the Pope to advance himſelf, and added the Sword to Excommunication by miſchievous decree, yet) altered not the common way of Election, and decreeth that every City (like our Corporations) have a Biſhop, and none meddle in another's Dioceſs without his conſent.

17. The choice of Pope *Conſtantine*, the humiliation of *Stephen*, and many ſuch inſtances ſhew that even at *Rome* ſtill the People had the greateſt hand in chuſing the Pope; and that to Communicate with a Biſhop irregularly choſen, was taken for a great ſin. And when *Charles Mag.* was gratified as to the Papal Chair, it was but by making him a neceſſary Confirmer.

18. The *French* Conſtitutions, *l.* 1. *c.* 84. objected about this by *Baronius* and *Binius*, ſay, *Not being ignorant of the ſacred Canons, we conſented to the Eccleſiaſtick Orders, to wit, that Biſhops be choſen by the Election of the Clergy and People, according to the Statutes of the Canons, out of their own Dioceſs, without reſpect of perſons or rewards, for the merit of their life, and their gift of wiſdom, that by example and word they may every way profit thoſe that are under them.*

19. The old Canons gathered by Pope *Adrian* and ſent to *Charles Magn.* recorded by *Caniſius*, depoſe a Biſhop, Presbyter or Deacon, guilty of Theft, Fornication or Perjury. And Can. 28. *A Biſhop who obtaineth a Church by the ſecular power, ſhall be depoſed.* And Can. 33. *That no one pray with Hereticks or Schiſmaticks: Ex conc. Sard.* Can. 2. *A Biſhop that by ambition changeth his ſeat, ſhall not have ſo much as Lay Communion at his end: That no Biſhop be above three weeks in another City, nor above two weeks from his own Church.* Can. 17. *A Biſhop contradicted* (by oppoſers) *ſhall not after be ordained or purged by only three Biſhops, but by many.*

And Can. 94. *The people converted from Hereſie by another Biſhop, may be of his flock, without removing their Pariſh dwelling where another is Biſhop.*

Amongſt the other 80 Canons againſt oppreſſion, as one is, *That no Biſhop judge any Prieſt without the preſence of his Clergy, it being void if not ſo confirmed*; So another is againſt all foreign Judgment, *becauſe*

men

men must be judged by those that are chosen by themselves and not by strangers. And none of the Clergy must be condemned till lawful Accusers be present, and the Accused answer the Charge.

20. The second General Council at *Nice*, though by servility they were for Images, held to the old Church-Canons for Elections, saying *Can.* 3. 'Every Election of a Bishop, Priest or Deacon, which is 'made by Magistrates, shall remain void, by the Canon which saith, 'If any Bishop use the secular Magistrates, to obtain by them a Church, 'let him be deposed and separated, and all that Communicate with 'him.

How much more say these than my [*intolerable indiscretion?*] I fear some will think that all this binds them to more separation than I am for.

The 15 Can. forbids them to have two Churches.

Can. 4. condemneth those to *Lex talionis*, as unsufferably mad, that faultily drive any from the Ministry, and segregate them from the Clergy, or shut up the Temples, forbidding God's worship.

21. By the way, a Council at *Chalons* under *Charles Magn.* finding some Prelates setting on foot an Oath of Obedience to them, thus condemn it:

'It is reported of some Brethren (Bishops) that they force them 'that they are about to Ordain, to swear that they are worthy, and 'will not do contrary to the Canons, and will be obedient to the Bi-'shop that Ordaineth them, and to the Church in which they are Or-'dained; which Oath, because it is very dangerous, we all ordain 'shall be forbidden;] which other Councils after repeat, (yet our Bishops rest much on such an Oath of obedience to them.)

22. What the Electing Churches were may be partly conjectured from the *Concil. Regiaticin.* in *Canisius*, Can. 6. *That the Arch-Presbyters examine every Master of a Family particularly, and take account of their Families and lives, &c.*

A Council at *Soisons* about 852. (a Presbyter by the King's Command being Ordained to the Church of *Rhemes* irregularly) Decree, *That they that are made Presbyters without examination by ignorance, or by dissimulation of the Ordainers, when they are known shall be deposed, because the* Catholick Church *defendeth that which is irreprobensible, &c.*

23. *An.* 855. under *Lotharius Rennigius Lugd.* and others, at a Council decreed, (because that bad King had by imposing corrupted the Clergy) 'That because Bishops were set over the Cities that were un-'tryed, and almost ignorant of Letters, and unlike the Apostolick pre-

'ſcript, by which means the Eccleſiaſtical vigor is loſt, they will pe-
't;tion the King that when a Biſhop was wanting, the Canonical Electi-
'o n by the Clergy and the People may be permitted, that men of try-
'ed knowledg and life, and not illiterate men, blinded by covetouſ-
'neſs, may be ſet Biſhops over the Flocks.

24. *An.* 857. Pope *Nic.* I. is choſen by the Emperour *Ludovicus* conſent, and by All the People. And he ſo far maketh the People ſelf-ſeparating judges, as to decree, *Tit.* 11. *c.* 1. 'That none hear the 'Maſs of a Prieſt whom he knoweth undoubtedly to have a Concu-'bine or ſub-introduced Woman. *And* Can. 2. That by the Canons 'he cannot have the honour of Prieſthood, that is faln into Forni-'cation.

25. *An.* 1050, (or thereabout) one of the worſt of Popes at a Council at *Rhemes*, was conſtrained to confirm the old Canon; 'That 'no man be promoted to Church-Government but with the election 'of the Clerks and the People, &c.

26. *An.* 1059. Again a *Roman* Council forbidding all men to joyn with a fornicating Prieſt, maketh them ſo far ſeparating judges.

27. About *An.* 1077. A Council at *Rome* reneweth the Canon, nulling all Ordinations made, *aut pretio, precibus aut obſequio*, or that are not made by the common conſent of Clergy and People; for ſuch enter not by Chriſt, &c.

28. From hence the Popes grew to uſurp moſt of the power in chuſing Biſhops to themſelves by degrees, till they got Councils to judg it Hereſie for Emperours to claim ſo much as a confirming inveſtiture. Whence bloody Wars roſe. And it's greatly to be noted that yet theſe Emperours ſuppoſed the Biſhops elected by the Clergy and People, and claimed but the ſaid inveſtiture, as is ſeen in the *formula* of Pope *Paſchals* Grant of inveſtitures to them.

29. When they made Princes Inveſtiture Sacrilege (and entring by them) they ſo far made the People judges of Prieſts and Communion, as in a Council at *Benevent. an.* 1087. *ſub Vict.* to decree, 'That 'if no Catholick Prieſt be there, it's righter to perſiſt without viſible 'Communion, and to Communicate inviſibly with the Lord, than by 'taking it from an Heretick to be ſeparated from God. For what con-'cord hath Chriſt and Belial? And Simoniacks are Infidels.

30. But were good and bad Biſhops in all Ages thus minded, or was it only Popes? I next add that it was one of the Articles charged againſt *Wickliffe* the Reformer (as before againſt *Wecelo*, who contemned their Excommunications) *That they that give over Preaching or*

hearing

bearing Gods word, for mens Excommunications, are Excommunicate, and in the day of judgment ſhall be judged traitors to Chriſt. Art. 13. in Conc. Conſt.

Reader, are we not in a hard ſtrait between *Wickliffs* and Dr. *Stillingfleet*?

31. The ſame is one of the Articles againſt *John Hus*, That men muſt not for Excommunications give over preaching. We grant that they mean *unjuſt ones.*

32. This became one of the great Controverſies with the *Bohemians*, againſt whom one of the four long Orations were made at *Conc. Baſil.* They would never yield that their choſen Miniſters ſhould obey the Silencers.

33. Laſtly, the *Romans* themſelves oft decreed, *That a ſimoniacal election even of the Pope is plainly null, and conferreth no right or authority to the elected* (though this certainly overthroweth the uninterruptedneſs of their own Succeſſion.) And how Popes were elected till the device of Cardinals, is well known.

§. 15. If all this be not enough to prove the conſtant conſent of the Chriſtian Churches down from the Apoſtles for the neceſſity of the Flocks conſent to the relation of the Biſhop and Paſtors to them, Let him that would have more read all that *Blondel* hath produced, *de jure plebis in regim. Eccleſ.*

§. 16. I ſhall next prove the ſaid neceſſity from the nature of the thing, the work and benefit, and the common nature, intereſt and reaſon of mankind, if more light will not put out the eyes of ſome unwilling men, that are loth to know what they cannot eaſily be ignorant of.

And 1. Propriety is in order of nature antecedent to Regiment, which ſuppoſeth it, and is to order the uſe of it for common ſafety and good.

2. As a mans propriety in his Members, Children, acquiſitions, is antecedent to Regiment, ſo much more in his ſoul which is himſelf.

3. Nature obligeth all to care for their lives, but yet thoſe muſt ſometime be hazarded for publick good. But the obligation to pleaſe God and obtain Salvation and eſcape Sin and Hell, is ſo great, that no man is to pretend publick good or the will of man againſt it.

4. Self-government (as to power and obligation) is antecedent to humane publick Government in order of Nature: And publick Government doth not deſtroy it, but regulate it: And therefore is not for deſtruction but for edification.

5. The

5. The end of Self-government is ſo much to pleaſe God and ſave our Souls, that no man on pretence of publick Government can diſoblige us from this.

6. God hath in the fifth Commandment, which ſetleth humane Government and obedience, choſen the name of Parents rather than Princes, becauſe Parents Government is antecedent to Princes, and Princes cannot take it from them, nor diſoblige their Children. But Self-government is more natural than Parents, and Parents and Princes muſt help it, but not deſtroy it.

7. When perſons want natural capacity for Self-government (as Infants and Ideots and mad-men) they are to be governed by force as bruits, being not capable of more.

8. Family Government being in order next to perſonal, Princes or Biſhops have no right to overthrow it, (at leaſt except in part on ſlaves of whoſe lives they have abſolute power:) If the King impoſe Wives, Servants, and Diet on all his Subjects, they may lawfully chuſe fitter for themſelves if they can; and at leaſt may refuſe unmeet Wives and Servants, and mortal or hurtful Meats and Drinks.

9. Much more if Princes and Patrons will impoſe on all men, the Biſhops and Paſtors, to whoſe charge, care and Paſtoral conduct they muſt commit their Souls, the people having the neareſt right of choice, and ſtrongeſt obligation, muſt refuſe (as diſcerning Self-governing judges) ſuch whoſe hereſie, negligence, ignorance, malignity, or treachery, is like either apparently to hazard them, or to deprive them of that Paſtoral help which they find needful for them, and they have right to as well as other men.

10. The gain or loſs is more the Patients than the Impoſers: It is their own Souls that are like to be profited and ſaved by needful helps, or loſt for want of them: And therefore it moſt concerns themſelves, to know what helps they chuſe.

11. If all the Kings on earth command men to truſt their lives to a Phyſician who they have juſt cauſe to believe, is like to kill them, by ignorance, errour, or treachery, or to a Pilot or Boat-man that is like to drown them, they are not bound to obey ſuch mandates. Yea if they know an able faithful Phyſician that is moſt like to cure them, they may chuſe him before an unknown man, though the King be againſt their choice.

12. Scripture and experience tell us, that God worketh uſually according to the aptitude of means and inſtruments: and learned experienced Phyſicians cure more than the ignorant, raſh, and ſlothful;

and

and good Scholars make their Pupils more learned than the ignorant do. And skilful, able, experienced holy Paſtors, convert and edifie much more than ignorant and vicious men: And means muſt accordingly be choſen.

13. If the Paſtoral work skilfully and faithfully done, be needful, it muſt not be neglected whoever forbid it: If it be not needful, what is the Church of *England* good for, more than Infidels, or at leaſt than *Moſcovites*? And for what are they maintained by Tythes, Glebe, and all the dignities, honours and wealth they have? And for what do men ſo much contend for them?

14. It is natural to generate the like; and for men to do and chuſe as they are, and as their intereſt leadeth them. Chriſt tells us how hard it is for a rich man to be ſaved, and how few ſuch prove good. And the Clergy themſelves do not ſay that all the Patrons in *England* are wiſe and pious: Many Parliaments have by our Church-men been deeply accuſed: And moſt Parliament men, I think, are Patrons: Others ſay, that moſt Patrons not choſen to Parliaments are worſe. Some Preachers complain of Great men for fornication, drunkenneſs, exceſs, idleneſs, yea, Atheiſm or infidelity: If many or any be ſuch, are they like to chuſe ſuch Paſtors as all godly men may truſt in ſo great a Caſe? Or would not ſuch Princes chuſe ſuch Biſhops?

15. Men are as able and as much obliged now to take heed to whoſe conduct they truſt their Souls, as they were in all former Ages of the Church, forecited.

16. The Laws and Biſhops of *England* allow all men liberty to chuſe what Church and Paſtor, that Conformeth, they pleaſe; ſo they will but remove their dwellings into the Pariſh which they affect. And in *London* thouſands live as Lodgers, and may eaſily go under whom they will chuſe; And if they like him not, may ſhift as oft as they pleaſe.

17. Pariſh bounds are of much uſe for Order: But Order is for the thing ordered, and not againſt it: And Pariſh bounds being of humane make, cannot juſtly be preferr'd before the needful edification and ſafety of mens Souls, though ſuch humane Laws bind, where there are no greater obligations againſt them.

18. The Law of keeping to Pariſh-Churches where we dwell, and the Law that giveth Patrons the choice of all the Paſtors, and Princes of Biſhops, are of the ſame efficient power and ſtrength.

19. Caſuiſts uſually ſay (even Papiſts that are too much for Papal power) that humane Laws bind not when they are againſt the end, the

the common good, especially against mens salvation. And a *Toletan* Council decreeth, *that none of their Canons shall be interpreted to bind* ad culpam, *but* ad pœnam, *lest they cause mens damnation.* And many Casuists say, that *Penal Laws* bind only to do or suffer, and bearing the penalty satisfieth them, save as to scandal.

20. Yet we still acknowledge all the right in Princes and Patrons before-mentioned, and that Princes are bound to promote Learning and piety, and so to see that due places, countenance and maintenance encourage faithful Ministers, and that all the Subjects have meet Teachers, and submit to hear and learn; And that they should restrain Hereticks and Soul-betrayers, from the sacred Office-work; and judg who are to be maintained, and who to be tolerated.

21. But this power is not absolute but bounded: And if on the pretence of it, they would betray the Church and starve Souls (like the *English* Canon that binds all from going to an able Pastor at the next Parish, from an ignorant unpreaching vicious Reader,) men are not bound to obey it, but to provide better for themselves (unless *materially*, not *formally* for some time, when not obeying would do more hurt than good;) or as a man must forbear publick assemblies in a common Plague-time.

And so much to open the true reason of the case in hand. And *Paul*'s words to *Timothy*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 16. tell me, this care is not unnecessary, *Take heed to thy self and to the doctrine, and continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thy self and them that hear thee.*

§. 17. I come now to the Doctor's words, who *p.* 312. undertakes to prove, 1. *That the main ground of the peoples Interest was founded on the Apostles Canon* [*A Bishop must be blameless.*]

Ans. The word [*main*] may do him service, but no hurt to my cause. [*Main*] signifieth not [*Only*:] who doubts but the People were to discern the Lives of chosen persons? But (without coming to the Ballance, among many causes which is the *main*) I have proved that there were more; And among others, that Christ and his Apostles bid them *take heed how they hear: beware of false Prophets, and their leaven: beware of the concision. A man that is an Heretick avoid.* — *Bid them not good speed: Let no man deceive you,* —*Those that cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine ye have learned, avoid,* —*from such turn away.* —Is here no more than judging their lives?

§. 18. Here he cometh to prove this even by *Cyprian*'s Epistle against *Martial* and *Basilides*: I must not name his dealing with it, lest he say *I rail.* But I may note, 1. that he saith, [*the force of what* Cyprian

Cyprian *saith comes at last only to this giving Testimony.*]

Answ. Only here is more than *Main* before. And though it was a matter of scandal that was before them, and therefore it is no wonder if nothing else be particularly spoken of; yet sure these words signifie more than *Testimony.* [*By publick judgment and Testimony be approved worthy and meet.*] And to be *sound in the faith, and apt to teach is some part of meetness.* And [*because they chiefly have power either to chuse Priests that are worthy, or refuse the unworthy.*] *A chief chusing power of the worthy is more than a meer testimony of fact.* Again, [*that by the suffrage of the whole fraternity the Episcopacy be delivered to him.*] *Suffrage is more than testimony of fact.* And [*All they do sin who are defiled by the sacrifice of a prophane and unjust Priest*] signifieth a dissenting power, or else separation were no duty.

But he saith, *This is the strongest testimony in antiquity for the peoples power.*

Answ. A strange saying of so good an Historian, who may easily know that the concurrent judgment of all the Churches, their practice, and their Canons, making the Peoples consent (and usually Election) necessary, was a far stronger testimony than one Epistle. But to weaken this he saith,

1. *It was in a case where a Bishop had voluntarily resigned.*

Answ. 1. What's that to the general rule here asserted? 2. Was it *voluntarily* which they were adjudged to do? But I find no mention of *Martial's voluntary resigning*, but only *Basilides.*

2. He saith [*Another Bishop was put in his place, not by the power of the people, &c.*]

Answ. 1. This was before said [*that the people might give them power? No.*] As if he would have the Reader think that we hold *the people give the power*, which I have so oft disproved. But it's his advantage to talk to many men at once, that he may say, *some of you said it.*

But if distinction were not a crime, I would distinguish between giving the power, and concurring with other Causes to give a Receptivity to the person that must have it: The peoples consent is *a causa partialis*, of *capacity* and *receptivity.*

2. But what signifie these words [*The Ordination of our Collegue* Sabinus *by the suffrage of the whole fraternity, and by the judgment of the Bishops, &c.*] Is not this as much power as we plead for?

3. Are not you the Author of the Defence of B. *Laud*, and say, *That Christ gave the Keys to* Peter *as the representative of the whole Church?* And have you now said more against me or your self? I am not of that mind.

3. He saith, *They had the judgment of a whole Council for deserting him.*

Anſw. Yes, for deſerting *them both*? And that Council told them God had fore-determined in his word what men muſt or muſt not be Biſhops, and it was God rather than they that judged it and bound them to obey; and that the power was chiefly in the people to chuſe and refuſe &c.] Did you think you had helpt your cauſe by ſaying, *It was a whole Council that was for what we ſay*?

4. He ſaith, *It was for Idolatry and blaſphemy by his own confeſſion.*

Anſw. Which mean you by [*his*] when they were two? neither of them were otherwiſe Idolaters than as *Libellaticks* (who to ſave their lives ſuffered other men to ſubſcribe their names, thinking it was not their own deed; like ſome that I have heard of, that thought Conformity Perjury, &c. but let a Friend bribe an Officer to ſubſcribe their names and give them a Certificate.) And *Baſilides'* blaſphemy was in his ſickneſs in terrour of Conſcience and perhaps phrenſie.

5. He ſaith all St. *Cyprian's* proof is, *that the people were moſt concerned to give teſtimony of life, &c.* This is anſwered already.

§. 19. His next is, *The people on this aſſuming the power of Elections, cauſed great diſturbance and diſorders in the Church*; where he goeth over ſome few of the many inſtances, which I have at large recited, at *Antioch, Rome, Alexandria, &c.*

Anſw. 1. And yet for all theſe diſorders, the Church deprived not the People of their priviledge.

2. But how fallaciouſly is this urged? I have fully elſewhere opened to the Reader, how the aſpiring Prelates ſeeking Patriarchates and Biſhopricks became as ſo many Captains at War, and gathered Monks, Clergy and People to ſtrive and fight for them; And now he layeth this on the People? As if the common Souldiers and not the Generals were the cauſe of the War? But of this I have ſaid enough.

§. 20. He ſaith, *To prevent this many Biſhops were made without the choice of the People, and Canons made to regulate Elections.*

Anſw. Craftily ſaid! He ſaith not [*without the conſent of the People,*] but [*the Election.*] And he ſaith not that the Canons took away either *conſenting* or *electing* ſuffrages, but that they *regulated them*: Yes, they over and over confirmed them.

§. 21. He ſaith, *At* Alexandria *the Election belonged to the twelve Presbyters.*

Anſw. They are hard put to it when they are put to fly to that teſtimony which maketh Presbyters the makers of Biſhops.

Hierome and *Eutychius Alexand.* tell you that the Presbyters choſe and made the Biſhops, as the Army doth a General: which made Arch-Biſhop

Bishop *Usher* tell King *Charles* the First, That the Presbyters at *Alexandria* did more than Ordain Presbyters, for they made Bishops (as he told me himself.) But 1. We never denied that the Com-provincial Bishops ordinarily afterwards Ordained them, 2. Nor that the Presbyters chose them. Did the Doctor think this was to the purpose? But 1. Doth he think that the Presbyters *choice* excludeth the Peoples, when it is a known thing that the Canons and Custom constantly conjoyned them?

2. Will he conclude that when-ever History nameth not the Peoples choice, they are left out?

3. Will he perswade us when the People are not the chusers, that they are not necessarily the consenters or refusers?

I will add one more proof to all before-mentioned. It is impossible, *ex naturâ rei*, that the Pastoral Office should be exercised on dissenters: Therefore their consent is necessary.

A Patient may be drencht like a Horse, and cram'd like fatted Fowl, and so may have a Physician against his will. But a Soul cannot use Pastoral help unwillingly. 1. He cannot unwillingly be baptized: 2. Nor unwillingly joyn in publick prayer and praise with the Church. 3. Nor unwillingly confess sin. 4. Nor unwillingly crave or receive Ministerial counsel. 5. Nor unwillingly receive the Lords Supper. 6. Nor unwillingly desire the Pastors visitation and prayers in his sickness. 7. Nor unwillingly seek and receive absolution, &c. I mean, he can do none of this that doth not consent. And is he a Pastor to such men that refuse all this? It's a shame to think that learned men should bend their wits to prove that the Sun is not light.

Did the Church at *Alexandria* ever after chuse their Bishops, and not before? All the *Alexandrian* Church-History tells us that the people there indeed exercised too great power, after this, no place on earth more tumultuous and unruly: And yet no place where the Bishops were more secular, and more assumed the power of the Sword: But the people chose them.

4. And if it had been true that the choice lay only and absolutely on the Presbyters, how came they to have so long two Bishops and two Churches, besides the *Arians*?

5. And he wisely overlooketh the Question, who chose those Presbyters that were the chusers of the Bishop?

§. 22. He next instanceth, *ex Euseb. l. 6. c.* 10. in *Germanion* and *Gordius* Ordained by the Bishops in *Narcissus* place at *Hierusalem*.

Answ. 1. His argument, if any, must be this: *Eusebius* saith, *the*

Biſhops Ordained them, not mentioning the peoples conſent or choice: Ergo, *their conſent or choice was not uſed.* How eaſily might he have known that we would deny the conſequence? Doth any of us deny that the Biſhops were the Ordainers of Biſhops? 2. And even the words of *Euſebius* confute him, ſaying, *That when* Narciſſus *ſhewed himſelf again, the brethren* (no doubt the Laity) *intreated him to enjoy his Biſhoprick again.*

§. 23. His next inſtance is, [Severus *Biſhop of* Milevis, *in his life-time appointed his ſucceſſour, acquainting only the Clergy with it:* And Auguſtine *prevented the peoples diſturbance and got them to receive him.*]

Anſw. Thus it is ſome mens work to confute themſelves. It's a known thing that the peoples right was ſo univerſally and unqueſtionably acknowledged, that the Canons forbad any Biſhop to nominate and chuſe his Succeſſour, leſt it ſhould foreſtall them and prejudice their choice. And why elſe was the peoples reſiſtance feared? And what did *Auſtin* but perſwade them to conſent? And why doth he mention that the People conſented and received him, if they had no conſenting Vote, or right on juſt cauſe to diſſent? It would be an odd argument to prove, that a woman had no power of choice in Marriage, becauſe one was put to perſwade her to conſent? which proveth the neceſſity of her conſenting.

§. 24. He next tells us of *Auſtin*'s own nomination of his Succeſſour *Eradius.*

Anſw. More and more againſt himſelf. All that men do is in danger of miſcarrying by their faultineſs: Wiſe men would do their beſt to prevent this, and the peoples conſent being of neceſſity, they ſometimes will pre-engage them; ſo *Auſtin*'s predeceſſour thought it the craftieſt way in his life-time, to take in *Auſtin* for his Coadjutor or fellow Biſhop (two in a City) leſt the people ſhould miſs of ſo excellent a man: But this being againſt the Canons, *Auſtin* confeſſeth that he did it ignorantly, and diſowneth it. Yet leſt the people (who grew more and more faulty) ſhould miſchuſe, he in his life time commendeth to them *Eradius*, that their love to him might procure their acceptance. Doth not this prove that their choice or conſent was neceſſary? Reader, if the Doctor can perſwade thee that the Country have not the choice of Parliament men, becauſe ſome are commended or named to them, thy yielding is too eaſie.

§. 25. The next is the ſtory of *Paul* the *Novatian* out of *Socrat. l.* 8. (who hath but ſeven) *Paulus* was adviſing his Clergy to chuſe his Succeſſour; They told him their fear of their own diſagreement, and to prevent

prevent it, intreated him to nominate one. He made them promiſe to ſtand to it, and named *Mercianus* in a ſealed paper. Doth not this inſtance prove, that the Biſhop had not power to chuſe one of himſelf? And was not his fear of the diſagreement of the Clergy? And doth any of this diſprove the peoples conſenting right? And would the Doctor perſwade us that even the *Novatians* excluded them.

§. 26. He tells us, that the *Greek Canoniſts think that the Council of* Nice *took away all the power of election of Biſhops from the people, and gave it to the Biſhops of the Province.*]

Anſw. 1. In all reaſon he ſhould have cited thoſe Canoniſts; for it's ſtrange that yet their following Cuſtoms and Canons ſhould ſay the contrary. 2. There is not a word in the Canon cited about election, but only *ordination* [that all the Biſhops in the Province ſhould Ordain a Biſhop; But when that cannot be, there ſhall be at leaſt three preſent, and three more conſenting by writing.] And what's this to the Caſe of the Peoples election or conſent?

§. 27. Yet he bringeth more againſt himſelf, *viz.* Can. 18. *Concil. Antioch.* which is, *That if one be Ordained Biſhop and go not to the Pariſh, becauſe the people refuſe him, he ſhall have the honour and Office of a Biſhop, not troubling the peace of the Church*;] which plainly ſaith what I have oft ſaid, *That the people have no power to hinder any from being Miniſters or Biſhops indefinitely in the Church Univerſal*, but only to judge whether he ſhall be *theirs*: whereas the Ordainers have power in both caſes; and uſually were the firſt chuſers, though the people had a refuſing or accepting power, as there appeared cauſe.

§. 28. Next he addeth more for what I plead, that *Baſil* Ordaining one firſt, *perſwades the Senate and People to accept him*: Adding [*Their way then was, if the people did agree on a perſon to be Biſhop, to petition the Metropolitan and Synod, who had the full power to allow or refuſe him.*]

Anſw. Is not this a ſtrong proof that the people had no ſuch agreeing or chuſing power, becauſe the Metropolitan and Synod alſo had their vote? what need *Baſil* perſwade them to accept him, when they had no power to refuſe? Did *Baſil* or any Synod ſay, all people are bound to accept thoſe whom we chuſe, be they what they will, and not to try them and judge themſelves.

§. 29. And here I deſire the Reader to remember, 1. That we take the chief truſt to be by Chriſt committed to the Ordainers for taking in fit men, and keeping out the unfit: They being the only Judges (with the perſon himſelf) who ſhall be a Miniſter of Chriſt in the Church

Church Universal; And neither Magistrate or People have a power to chuse or refuse them.

2. That the Universal Church being one body of Christ, though Ministers have not such a charge of each others flocks as the particular Bishops of them have, yet are they bound to give them all the help they can (as neighbour families to help each other:) And therefore to offer to vacant Churches the best they know, and perswade them to accept them, when they are at a loss or need advice.

3. The people are bound to reverence the judgment of neighbour Pastors herein, and not causlesly to oppose.

4. When the People have chosen (or they and the Clergy,) if the person were not before Ordained, the Ordainers still are judges for their own act.

5. It was not usual to Ordain *sine titulo*, and the Ordainers did two things at once, 1. Judge absolutely *who shall be a Minister of Christ*? 2. Judge with the Church to which he was Ordained (Elders and People) who was fit for that Church, and should be theirs: And a threefold lock was safe.

6. By all this it appears that all the Doctors talk against the peoples unfitness to discern who are sound or Heretick, fit or unfit, is to no purpose: And that if unmeet men are Ministers or Bishops, the fault is ten times more in the Ordainers than in the People: seeing it is not the People but the Ordainers that are trusted to take into the Ministry indefinitely, but only among many to judg who shall be theirs, supposing them either before Ministers, or next to be made such by the Ordainers. And doth the Doctor think that the judgment of all parties is not as sure as of one alone? or that my refusing a Physician is any wrong to his Licensers or him?

§. 30. The *Laodicean* Canon cited by him speaketh for me as the rest: (Did he think I wanted his help to cite more for my self?) Who doubteth that the People being not the sole judges, if they took in an un-Ordained or un-approved man without the Synods consent, it was void? (By the way, do either Synods or People (the old chusers) chuse our Bishops or Priests?)

§. 31. Yet more for me, he citeth the *Chalced.* Council, turning out *Bassianus* and *Stephanus* from *Ephesus*, two men that strove and fought for the Bishoprick unto blood in the Church, and both pleaded they were lawfully called by Clergy, and People, (And yet had the People no right?) But they were both proved to be violent Intruders, and another chosen. And who doubts but a great General Council had the greatest power then?

§. 32.

§. 32. Next he tells us of a Law of *Justinian*, that made the *Clergy and better sort of Citizens chusers*. (And indeed *Nazianzene* once wisht the more religious sort were chusers:) but doth not this prove still the peoples power, though so long after by an Emperour the poorer were so restrained? I will not stay to search the Book, but take it as he citeth it.

§. 33. But his next seemeth to be downright against us, Can. 13. *Conc. Laodic.* But it is not so: *Crab* hath two translations: The first saith, *Quod non sit permittendum turbis electiones eorum facere qui sunt ad sacerdotium provehendi: It is not sufferable to chuse by tumults*: ergo, *not for the people to chuse at all, no nor dissent.* I deny the consequence. To forbid disorder is not to forbid choice or free consent.

§. 34. His next proof is *Nic. Conc.* 2. c. 3. which he saith, *restrained the election only to Bishops.*

Answ. Such dealing tells us that Protestant Doctors are not to be taken for infallible no more than Papists; I cited the Canon before: The doubt is whether it drive us not to more separation than we are willing of, by nullifying our Bishops and Priests calling. It is [*every election of a Bishop, Priest or Deacon, which is made by Magistrates, shall remain void, by the Canon which saith, If any Bishop use the secular Magistrates to obtain by them a Church, let him be deposed and separated, and all that communicate with him.*] Doth not the Doctor unhappily chuse his testimonies? Had it not been better to have past over this Council? Where now is all the Church of *England* by this Canon, if Bishops coming in by the King, and Parsons by the Patrons *be all void and null*, and the people *separated* that communicate with them? Such events are the fate of an ill cause. And the next Canon doth not amend their matter, which calleth it madness for gain or any affection of his own, to *drive any from the Ministry, or segregate one of his Clergy, he shall have* Lex talionis, *and his work shall fall on his own head.*

§. 35. He adds, [*Which was confirmed by following Councils in the* Greek *Church*, as Can. 28. *Const.* against *Photius*, *and the people are there excluded with an Anathema, so far were popular elections grown out of request in the Eastern Empire.*]

Answ. 1. Had this been true, it would not much move me, that these two Councils that set up *Image-worship*, and shewed much wickedness, should contradict the Apostolical and Catholick constitutions and practice. But, 2. I thank the Bishops, I am not able to buy the *French* Volumes of the Councils, and therefore what is there I know not: and my own Library is ruined to avoid their Agents distraining

ſtraining it for my Preaching: And Doctor *James* and others have taught me to prefer the oldeſt Editions of the Councils, and to take heed how I truſt the later and the Jeſuits pretended Manuſcripts. I have now none but *Crab* (who medleth not with this) and *Binnius*; And in *Binnius* there are but 14 Canons in the laſt Action, and 27 in the antecedent *Fragmenta*: and no ſuch thing as a 28*th* Canon to be found: Nor is there in the 27*th* any ſuch thing as the Doctor citeth.

2. But if there were, if it were but the confirmation of the 2. *Nicene* Canon, it were much againſt the Doctor's cauſe, and nothing for him.

3. But unhappily here alſo he ſends us to find out much againſt him. For beſides that the 8*th* Can. in *Fragm.* condemneth requiring ſubſcriptions to ſtick to the Patriarch (though they were not yet oaths of obedience) the 12*th* Canon is indeed the ſame with thoſe forecited, *viz.* "That the Apoſtolical and Synodical Canons flatly "forbidding promotions and conſecrations of Biſhops, by the power "and command of Princes, we concordantly define, and ſentence, "that if any Biſhop receive the conſecration of ſuch a dignity, by "the craft and tyranny of Princes, he ſhall be altogether depoſed, as "one that deſired and conſented to have the gift of God by the will "of carnal ſenſe, and from men and by men.

I ſuppoſe this is the Doctor's Canon which depoſeth all the *Engliſh* Biſhops, unhappily cited. And the Can. 14. requiring Princes to honour Biſhops, and condemning the Biſhops that debaſe themſelves to go far from their Church to meet a Prince, and that will alight to them from their Horſes, and that will baſely kneel to them, or will come to their tables, unleſs with purpoſe freely to reprove them] expoundeth both theſe Biſhops hearts and words. And ſo doth *Can.* 17. which condemneth ſuch as come not to Synods becauſe the Prince forbiddeth them, and ſaith, *That Princes have no right ſo much as to be ſpectators of the matters which at Synods fall out among Prieſts.* And here indeed an Anathema is pronounced againſt the obſtinately diſobedient Biſhops, that will not obey their Patriarch before *the forbidding Prince.*] And doth this meddle with the peoples Recipient power? which is only levelled againſt Princes and Lay Patrons Impoſitions, and depoſeth the *Engliſh* Clergy and Church?

The ſame is repeated, *Can.* 25. (which it's likely is that which he meant) *viz.* "That according to the old Canons the promotions "and conſecrations of Biſhops be made by the choice and decree of the

"the College, and that no Lay Princes or men in power (*potentium*) "do mix themselves in the election or promotion of Patriarchs, Me-"tropolitans, or any Bishop; lest hence there be inordinate confu-"sion or contention, specially seeing that it is not convenient that "any Potentates or other Lay-men have power in such matters, "but rather attend with silence. —— And if any Secular Prince or "Potentate (men in power) or Lay men of other dignity, strive "against the common and consonant and Canonical Election of the "Ecclesiastical Order, let him be anathema, till he consent and obey "in this, which the Church shall shew its will in, in the Election and "Ordination of its Proper Bishops.

Here, 1. The Churches will is made the determiner of the Election and Ordination of their proper Bishop. 2. The Canonical Order is established (which ever required the Clergies and Peoples consent.) 3. Nothing of the Laity but acts of Princes power and dignity is excluded: 4. And hereby our *English* Clergy deposed. The Doctor had been better to have let alone his History and Antiquities.

§. 36. His 4*th* note is, *Christian Magistrates did interpose in this matter as they judged expedient.*

Answ. Hitherto he hath produced the Testimonies of Councils and Bishops against Magistrates choice or medlings (mistakingly thinking it had been against the Flocks Receptive power) And now he will prove that Magistrates interposed, as you shall hear.

§. 37. And first [*So* Constantine *did in the Church of* Antioch. *Soz. l.* 2. *c.* 19.

Answ. What did he? He motioned a Bishop to end the difference; And who opposeth that?

§. 38. Next [*Constantius* put by two that the people strove about, and set up *Eusеb. Nicom.*

Answ. An unhappy testimony: *Socrates* whom he citeth thus relateth it, [Alexander *dying commended* Paulus *to the chusers as the fittest; but if they would have a man of prowess to chuse* Macedonius.] The people were divided in the choice, and made a greater stir than formerly; But the Orthodox carried it for *Paulus* against the Hereticks that were for *Macedonius*. *Constantius* being the first persecuting *Arian* Emperour, was offended, and got a Council to depose *Paulus*, and he got in his great favourite *Eusebius Nicomed.* the head of all the *Arians*. Doth not this shew, 1. That the people were chusers, 2. That the Emperour deposed him not, but by a packt Council of Bishops

(which we know had a deposing power?) 3. That this is Recorded as an Act of two Hereticks, a Prince and Prelate, wronging the Church.

§. 39. Saith he, [*When* Eusebius *was dead, the Orthodox party again chose* Paulus, *and* Constantius *sends* Hermogenes *to drive him out by force.*

Answ. 1. I doubt he will next cite *Valens*, *Genſericus*, *Hunnericus*, &c. for murdering and persecuting the Bishops. Was an *Arians* Tyranny, a note of right?

2. The story (in *Socrates* cited by him) is this: *Euseb.* the *Arian* being dead, the People again went to the choice, and chose as before: But some were kill'd in the tumult. The *Arian* Emperour sends *Hermogenes* to force out *Paulus* the chosen Bishop: The people tumultuously fight for their Bishop and priviledge, and set *Hermogenes* Lodgings on fire and kill him. The Emperour comes from *Antioch*, amerceth the City, and puts *Paul* out, and yet is angry that *Macedonius* was chosen by the other part without his advice; but consenteth to him.

1. Doth not this shew that the people were the chusers? 2. And even their murderous tumult moved neither an Heretick Prince nor the Bishops to deny their right of choice. 3. Murder and such violence was a fair colour for more severity. 4. Yet all this was by a Heretick noted as an act against the Church. 5. And all this was but about a Patriarch, and not an ordinary Bishop, and that at his Imperial seat, where it concerned the Emperours to have most regard. 6. And I told you that Princes are the Judges whom they should tolerate, whoever have the choice.

§. 40. He adds, *When* Athanasius *was restored*, Constantius *declared it was by the decree of the Synod and by his consent.*

Answ. 1. If he meant here to intimate the exclusion of the peoples consent or choice, he could scarce have named in History an instance more against himself, than that of *Athanasius*, who thereby was brought in, upheld and oft restored. 2. This History tells you the *Arian* Emperour was forced to this consent, to avoid a threatned War from his brother. 3. This was not to make him Bishop, but to call him to his flock from his banishment. 4. And doth not all this confirm what I plead for, as to the Peoples, Synods and Princes several parts?

§. 41. *Nectarius* case is next, about whom *Historians* disagree; but the most credible say, that the Council named *Nectarius* with some others

others in a paper, and in honour to an excellent Emperour, bid him take which he would: But all this excluded not the peoples part (who would not have left *Gregory* but by his own requeſt) and were glad to accept one from ſuch a Council and Prince.

§. 42. Next he ſaith out of *Sozomen*, *That the People and Clergy choſe* Chryſoſtome, *and* Arcadius *conſented*; and then he affronteth *Sozomen* with *Palladius*.

Anſw. 1. *Palladius* denyeth nothing that I plead for, but only tells us of the Emperours premotion and endeavours, (in his Royal City about a Patriarch) to prevent the diviſion of the people: Nor is *Palladius* credit to be equalled to *Sozomen*'s herein, much leſs preferred. 2. *Socrates* the moſt credible of all in this, ſaith, *l.* 6. *c.* 2. [*It ſeemed good to them to ſend for* John Chryſ. — *Wherefore not long after*, Arcadius *with the general conſent both of Prieſts and People ſent for him.*] And did not the Doctor think I needed help by ſuch Citations?

§. 43. The choice of *Neſtorius* was juſt ſuch another? The people had no reaſon to deny conſent to one out of *Chryſoſtom*'s Monaſtery, nominated by ſo good an Emperour; who was judge whom to tolerate in his Royal City: But both he and they after repented of the choice.

§. 44. His laſt inſtance is *Theodoſius* getting in *Proclus* before *Maximianus* was buried.

Anſw. Reader, 1. All this is a good Emperours care about one Patriarch of his own City to avoid diviſion, and nothing to the common choice of Biſhops.

2. The true caſe *Socrates* (cited) thus deſcribeth: The people were the chuſers: They were for *Proclus*; but ſome adverſaries objected a Canon, that a Biſhop might not be removed from one Church to another, and he being a Biſhop already they could not have him: *Socrates* pleadeth for the diſpenſableneſs of this Canon; but the people were fain to take *Maximianus*. The Emperour being for diſpenſing with that Canon, and gratifying the people that had before declared themſelves for *Proclus*, did not himſelf bring him in, but got *Celeſtine* Biſhop of *Rome* to write to *Cyril* of *Alexand.* *John* Biſhop of *Antioch* and *Rufus* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica* to ſatisfie them to do it; and ſo got *Proclus* in. What is this againſt the peoples right? Theſe be all the Doctor's inſtances on this point.

§. 45. His 5th note is, [*On the alteration of the Government of Chriſtendom there was greater reaſon for the Magiſtrates interpoſing than before:*

fore: Because of Princes endowing Churches, the Royal assent was fit,—though a Bishop was chosen by the Clergy and People.]

Answ. Who would strive against so friendly a disputer, that goeth on to say the same as I? when I doubt his party will say that he Prevaricateth.

§. 46. But he saith, *The Royal power overthrowing the Papal, reserved the power of nomination of Bishops as part of the Prerogative: which being allowed in frequent Parliaments, the consent of the people is swallowed up therein, since their Acts oblige the whole Nation.*

Answ. 1. I see we yet understand not how much of the *Irenicon* is retracted, and whether he yet hold not that no Form of Church-Government is of Divine Institution; or we be not bound to be for that which King and Parliament are for. But we undertake to prove the contrary, and have done it.

2. What if Parliaments gave the King power to chuse all Folks Wives and Husbands, Physicians, Tutors, Diet, Trade, &c. our Right were not swallowed up by this, though it were called the King's Prerogative. Much less where Gods Institution and the very Law of Nature have forestalled them, and neither God nor Man gave them that swallowing power.

3. I oft answered, that Tythes and Temples may be more in the Magistrates power, than Pastoral relation and power of the Keys.

§. 47. He saith, p. 326. *That the inferiour right of Patronage is justly thought to bear equal date with the settlement of Christianity in peace and quietness.*

Answ. 1. It was scarce ever setled in peace and quietness to this day: Much less during the *Saxons*-Heptarchy. 2. I have proved that the Universal Church was far from making Lay Patrons the chusers. 3. It is less lawful to sell our Souls into slavery than our bodies: And if our Ancestors had said to some rich men, *You shall all chuse our Pastors and we will stand to your choice, if you will build us Temples and give them Lands*; it would no more bind us to stand to their bargain, than if they had said, *Give us House and Land, and you shall chuse our Diet, Wives, Physicians, &c.* we say if your kindness be turned to our hurt, take your *house* and *land*, or give it to whom you will: *we will not sell our souls and Church-rights at such a price.*

§. 48. His 6th conclusion is, *That things being thus setled—there is no ground for the people to resume the liberty of Elections.*

Answ. 1. I need not over and over repeat the answer to his reasons. 2. If the liberty of *Election* be not resumed (which was not that

that which I pleaded for, as he would all along insinuate) yet the liberty of *free consent* or *refusal* may be necessary.

§. 49. Reader, again, the true case is like this following: *Parents* have a ruling power to chuse Wives and Husbands for their Children: Guardians have much power over Orphans in it. Magistrates may make Laws to restrain unlawful Marriages. Children are bound in these cases to obey Parents, unless they chuse to their apparent hurt or danger; and to obey Guardians and Magistrates in their proper Laws. But 1: It is for all this no Marriage till both parties consent. 2: And all the said power over them is limited, and but directive and not destructive to their own consenting power.

Even so in our case; 1. The Ordainers are the first Judges, and have a power like Parents, and none should be received against their wills, unless they would betray the Church. 2. The Magistrates may make ordering restraining Laws, that no unworthy person shall be tolerated: 3. A limited power of nomination may be left to Patrons, as Guardians, who have power to help the Churches, but none to hurt; much less to ruine them: 4. But it is not a Church related as Pastor and Flock, till both consent. These things are evident truth, though some would bury it in a heap of words.

§. 50. I would also if I could have drawn the Doctor to resolve me this doubt; *Whether the power of Parents and Husbands, or of Patrons, yea or Princes be greater, in the choice of Food, Physick, and so of a Tutor, a Pastor or a particular Church Communion.* And if a *Parent* or *Husband* say, I command you to hear and Communicate with such a Pastor and Congregation, and the Patron say the contrary, yea, or the Prince or Law, which is to be obeyed? And to whom this Family Government most belongeth? And why Father and Mother rather than Prince and Priests are named in the Fifth Commandment?

§. 51. p. 329. He reciteth my reasons, why Parliaments cannot take away our free Receptive consent, and he again feigneth that I say all this for the peoples *chusing power*, yet confesseth I deny not the Magistrates or Patrons power of their own Gift. (The Case of Sacrilege I leave to their Consciences.)

§. 52. p. 330. But saith he, *Anabaptists, Quakers, and all may pretend a care of their Souls, and so leave the Minister only the Temple and Tythes.*

Answ. 1. And *Anabaptists* and *Quakers* will have a care of their Souls, when you have said and done all you can against it: A prison will not overcome it: 2. So

2. So *Turks*, *Socinians*, *Papists*, (or *Anabaptists* if you will) when they get into power, may pretend that they are fitter to be truſted with mens Souls, than men with their own: And ſo Prelates may ſay: But is nothing true that men can abuſe and miſapply?

And to me it is ſomething, though it ſhould be nothing to you, 1. That nature obligeth and diſpoſeth every man more to care for his own ſoul, than it doth the Patron to care for others. 2. That many hundred or thouſand men are not all ſo like to miſtake and miſcarry about their own Souls, as one Patron is that is far from their hearts. 3. That it is a matter more dangerous to truſt thouſands in one hand than in many (as it would be in a ſtorm to put all into one boat.) If that man miſcarry he endangereth multitudes: If another man miſcarry it is but for one.

3. To have a ſelf-ſaving power, and to have a ſelf-deſtroying power, differ (with men that hate not diſtinction.) So little can a man know what we ſay by this Doctors Anſwers, that a ſtranger would think by him that we were quite of another mind. I never ſaid *Quakers* or any others may have whom they will: If they chuſe men uncapable, the neighbour Biſhops or the Clergy may admoniſh them, and renounce his Communion; And the Magiſtrate may reſtrain him and refuſe to tolerate an intolerable man: And yet the people ought not to accept an uncapable man offered by Biſhops or Patrons; no nor a man next to uncapable when they need and may have much better. Many Negatives are ſafe.

§. 53. He ſaith, *The prophane have right to their own ſouls, and to the care of them, and therefore are equally concerned with others* (to chuſe.)

Anſw. It is ſad with the Church when they need to be ſaved from ſuch reaſonings of their great Teachers.

1. A Right to care for their Souls giveth no man right to chuſe men for others Souls, to do that which they will not have done for their own. The queſtion is, whether that man will Communicate with the Church on Chriſts terms? He refuſeth and will not (elſe he ought not to be refuſed.) And ſhall he that refuſeth Communion chuſe one to give it others, becauſe he hath a Soul himſelf? Had the neighbour Heathens and Hereticks of old power to chuſe Biſhops for the Church, while they refuſed to be of the Church themſelves? Shall he that will not be of the Society chuſe for the Society?

2. We diſtinguiſh between what a man may be forced to, and what not. He may not be forced to the great gift of Sacramental Remiſ-

ſion

sion and Communion, because no unwilling person hath right to it: But an ignorant person may be forced as a *Catechumen* or *hearer*, to hear what can be said for his conviction: For truth may conquer the unwilling. But none on this pretense can hinder the Church from hearing its own Pastors, nor force men to be the ordinary Auditors of Mahometans, Hereticks or Heathens.

§. 54. p. 331. He again tragically exclaims of me, on the old false supposition, that I make the people the sole chusers, and not only plead for their free Negative Vote (though chusing also, but not alone, was the old way;) And here tells us of the tumults that would follow.

Answ. 1. So they would if the people chose in *France*, *Spain*, *Italy*: And yet I would they did. No humane actions are free from inconveniencies; which are not to be cured with a mischief.

2. Let him name me ten places that have suffered so deeply by the peoples choice, as I can tell him of ten thousand that have done by the choice of Prelates, Patrons and Princes, and I will confess my errour. It was not by the peoples choice that all preaching was put down in *Moscovy*: It is not the people that have this many hundred years chosen all the Popish Bishops, Mass-priests, &c. in *Italy*, and most of the *Roman* Church, even in *Spain*, *France*, *Bavaria*, *&c.*

3. I told him, but had no answer, that not only the Innes of Court, but also *Black fryars*, *Aldermanbury*, and such other places as have chosen their own Teachers, have (peaceably) had as happy a succession of Learned, Godly, able Pastors, as any place in *London* or in *England*.

4. It's known by experience that Learning and great worth doth as Light so reveal it self to humane nature, that usually most of those that are loth to be holy themselves, would have a Saint and an able man.

5. Doth he think in his Conscience that all the Patrons in *England* are liker to be judicious, and free from solicitations, favour and respect of persons, than the majority of the Communicants of such Churches?

6. If the Parsons first admit great numbers of profane, and wicked men to be Communicants, and then tell us how unfit these men are to chuse: they do but condemn themselves.

§. 55. p. 333. He tells us we do but say, *We judge, we think, &c. the things unlawful, but for particular arguments to prove them unlawful, he finds none.*

Answ.

Anſw. If this be true, then they that never found our arguments never anſwered them. (If it be not true, it is not well.) Then you here, and Mr. *Falkener*, *Fulwood*, *Durel*, *&c.* have not yet anſwered any of our arguments. Remember this.

2. Though I did not argue, but name the things in my firſt Plea, you and others took it for arguing; and we ever craved leave to do it.

3. Is it true indeed, that there are no arguments, in our Writings, 1660. and 1661. with the Biſhops, nor any in my Book of Concord, or Treatiſe of Epiſcopacy, nor in my old Diſputations of Church-Government, nor in any other mens Books theſe eighteen years? I doubt the angry Biſhops will think that in my Treatiſe of Epiſcopacy there is ſome ſort of Argument; and that my Book againſt Sacril. Deſertion of the Miniſtry hath ſome: and that an Apology for our preaching (now in the Preſs) hath ſome. But if there be none, accuſe us of none.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Of the Impoſed uſe of the Croſs in Baptiſm, and denying Baptiſm to the refuſers.

§. 1. PAge 348. He cometh to our [*charge againſt the Church*] (though he never found any Arguments as aforeſaid.)

And 1. Why doth he ſilently balk the chief things which I had named? will this ſatisfie Conſcience? will excuſing ſome things make others lawful?

II. As to what he ſaith for the Croſs, I have ſo fully anſwered it twice to Mr. *Cheney*, and once to the *Impleader*, that I am loth to repeat all again. In ſhort, 1. He ſaith the Church intends it not [*for a ſign of Immediate dedication.*]

Anſw. 1. What is the *Medium?* 2. What if it were not Immediate? 3. Can it be more Immediate than in the very preſent dedicating act, to uſe the ſign and expreſſing the dedicating ſignification?— 4. The words of the Canon are, [*To dedicate them by that badge to his ſervice, whoſe benefits beſtowed on them in baptiſm the name of the Croſs doth repreſent.*] And after [*the Church of* England *accounteth it an honourable badge whereby the Infant is dedicated to the ſervice of him that dyed on the Croſs.*] And the ſervice is named [Chriſtianity in practice,] to fight under his banner, &c.

2. He ſaith, [*In baptizing the Miniſter acts by Authority derived from Chriſt, but at Croſſing he ſpeaks in the name of the Church,* [*We receive this Child, &c.*]

Anſw. 1. It's meet it ſhould be ſo, that Chriſt's Sacraments be uſed by Chriſt's Authority, and mens by mens.

2. But I hope this is but a quibble; and that notwithſtanding the word [*we,*] the Miniſter as Chriſt's Miniſter, and in his name ſaith, [*we receive this child,*] when even the abſolved are to be received by Chriſt firſt, and then by the Church. I will not elſe aggravate the ill conſequences.

§. 2. He before ſaith, [*Was the Croſs a dedicating ſign to God, or a declarative ſign to men?*]

Anſw. The Canon ſaith expreſly twice, [To dedicate them by this badge to his ſervice—] And [an honourable badge whereby the In-

ſant is dedicated to his Service.] And the Rubrick which we muſt ſubſcribe, refers us to the Canon for the true ſenſe and reaſon of the Croſſing.

2. *Is Baptiſm and the Lords Supper a ſign to God, or to man?* It is a ſign to man for God: God knoweth not by ſigns, but inſtituteth ſigns for humane uſe. It is to dedicate them to God's ſervice.

§. 3. He ſaith, [*It repreſents the duty and not the Grace.*]

Anſw. 1. The words are, [*to his ſervice, whoſe benefits beſtowed on them in baptiſm, the name of the Croſs doth repreſent.*] Are the benefits ſo beſtowed no Graoe? or is Repreſenting no Repreſenting? or ſhall we believe the Doctor againſt the Church? or is this the kind of Conformity that he would teach us, by denying what we ſubſcribe to?

2. Sure the *Croſs of Chriſt with his dying on it*, expreſt alſo in the words of the Canon, is *Grace*. To repreſent or ſignifie *Chriſt dying on the Croſs* (which are the words and uſe) is immediately to repreſent or ſignifie the very *Grace* of *Redemption* it ſelf.

3. To be liſted under Chriſt as the Captain of our Salvation, and to be received into the Congregation of Chriſts flock, to fight under his banner, &c. are all great Grace.

4. The moral operation on the ſoul which the preface of the Liturgy aſcribes to the Ceremonies, is *Grace* to be wrought by them.

5. To make a common ſymbol or badge of Chriſtianity, ſolemnly obliging as a Covenanting ſign, by which they muſt be diſtinguiſhed from Infidels, and this even at our firſt Covenanting with Chriſt, is to make a Sacrament in the old ſence. What was the Souldiers *Sacramentum Militare* more, from which the Church ſeems to have borrowed the name? The Oath was obliging; The colours or *cingulum* was obliging and a ſignifying badge: The good received was the *honour*, *relation* and hope of future pay or preferment upon performance. And is not all this in ours?

6. If you have wit ſtrong enough to juſtifie all this humane addition to Chriſts great inſtitution, muſt all men be compelled to practiſe as you and ſuch others judge, becauſe you think they do not confute you? Who gave you or ſuch others *right* to ſilence, reject from Chriſtendom, &c. all ſuch as are not herein of your mind; even when you deny what your Canon expreſly ſaith?

§. 4. He ſaith, *It addeth nothing to Baptiſm which is compleat before.*

Anſw. What's this to our queſtion? *It adds another Sacrament to Baptiſm:*

Baptiſm: The Lords Supper is another Sacrament of the ſame Covenant added to perfect Baptiſm by Chriſt; and the Croſs by men.

§. 5. But all the difficulty is thus removed (he thinks) and by the foreſaid quibble of [*I baptize*] and [*we receive.*]

Anſw. Difficulties are eaſilier removed with ſome men, than with others.

1. He dare not ſay that the Miniſter ſpeaks not as from Chriſt, when-ever he ſaith [*we*] in the plural number.

2. Doubtleſs it is firſt Chriſts act, and then the Churches to *Receive the Baptized into the flock of Chriſt:* And the Miniſter herein firſt ſpeaketh Chriſts act and then the Churches.

3. The words [*we receive*] him, goeth before the Croſſing and is named eſpecially as part of the Miniſtration of Baptiſm, being its immediate effect. And what a dangerous invention is it to ſay that the Miniſter here ſpeaketh not from Chriſt but the Church, in receiving in thoſe dedicated to him?

4. And he will make us a hard task of it, to know when the Prieſt ſpeaks as God's Miniſter, and when as the peoples Miniſter or mouth?

§. 6. He brings us the inſtance of one after Baptiſm, *engaging himſelf in the Independent Church Covenant by holding up his hand.*

Anſw. 1. It is ſuppoſed that the Covenant which he mentioneth is not the Covenant of Chriſtianity, but (that ſuppoſed) a conſent or promiſe to live in the relation and duty of a Chriſtian member of that particular flock. And this is much like a Covenant between a Chriſtian Man and Wife, Tutor and Pupil: And as men may make particular contracts, they may make particular ſigns of them, (as is the Ring and taking hands in Marriage; the crowning of a Chriſtian King, &c.) But if you ſuppoſe the Independant Covenant to repeat alſo and contain the Covenant of Chriſtianity it ſelf as the firſt part, then that which is required is but *ſignified conſent:* And as all Chriſtians renew their conſent at each *Euchariſt Sacramentally*, ſo do they frequently by *word* and *deed*, and all due ſignification of conſent. Nature and Cuſtom of humane converſe have made words and geſtures ſignifiers of conſent: But Sacraments and ſolemn badges of this nature ſignifie by *Inſtitution* of the inventer or impoſer.

The ſin lyeth in arrogating Chriſts prerogative, and accuſing his Laws of inſufficiency. If Chriſt (by his act and ſpirit) had not ſeparated one day in ſeven for the Commemoration of his Reſurrection,

he had not told us that this is his own work as *Legiſlator*. But now he hath ſeparated one day, if man will make a Law that another day alſo of the week ſhall be ſeparated to the ſame uſe, it is as much as to ſay, 1. *We have authority to make ſuch Laws as Chriſt made.* 2. And to amend his Law by this addition. For if it had been fit to be made, there was the ſame reaſon then for Chriſt to have ſeparated two days.

So is it in this caſe. If Chriſt had made no Sacraments, we might more have doubted whether he took it for his proper work: But where he hath made two, to make more of the ſame nature, to me ſeemeth too bold: He could have made the Sacrament of the dedicating Croſs if he would have had it. If our Biſhops ſhould command us to ſay we believe Chriſts reſurrection, or to ſtand up to ſignifie it, to avoid confuſed noiſe, we refuſe it not: But if they would make a Law that none ſhall be Chriſtened that will not let the Prieſt put him into a Coffin or Grave and take him out again to repreſent the Reſurrection, I think it ſafeſt to deny obedience to ſuch arrogant uſurpation.

§. 7. He confeſſeth, *It belongs to Chriſt only to appoint the means of conveying his own grace.*

Anſw. I have before proved that the Croſs is by this Church appointed as ſuch a means, and named the Grace and conveyance.

§. 8. He ſaith, [*Though it belong to the King to make the badge or ſymbol of his own ſubjects, yet every Nobleman may give a diſtinct Livery without treaſon.*]

Anſw. True: And this opens the Caſe. A badge of the Kings ſubjects is not the ſame thing, with the badge of a ſubjects ſervant: But the Croſs is not the badge of a humane ſubordinate contract or relation (as City Covenants, or Paſtoral particular contracts, &c.) but of Chriſtianity it ſelf, and of the ſubjects of Chriſt as ſuch.

§. 9. p. 353. He ſaith, *Is our worſhip directed to it or may we kneel before it, as Mr.* B. *allows men may do before a Crucifix?*

Anſw. But if this be not true, or be a deceiving intimation, you ſhould not allow your ſelf to write it. My words are in *Chriſt. Direct. q.* 113. *p.* 876. When I had named 21 Caſes in which an Image may not be uſed, (and among the reſt, when it is ſcandalous, or tempting to ſuperſtition, &c.) I named many Caſes in which an Image may be uſed; and ſay [*that it is not unlawful to pray before or towards an Image, in a Room where they are placed only for Ornament, &c.*] Is this to ſay, (*worſhip may be directed to it? or that we may kneel before a Crucifix*;) when I had before excepted the Images of God,

God, Christ, &c. in worship, on several reasons? Doth any Protestant doubt of what I assert? My Parlour hath on all four sides the pictures of our living friends: must I not pray in that room because my face will be still towards some of them? Doth he doubt of this? Or is not his citing one half of the words as he doth, to deceive his credulous Reader, if not worse?

§. 10. He saith, *Kneeling before a Crucifix is lawful to him supposing the mind be only excited by it.*

Answ. A Calumny made up by setting together two scraps of remote sentences. 1. Because I say it's lawful to pray in a room where pictures (not any) are before me, for meer ornament, therefore he feigns me to say, *It's lawful to kneel before a Crucifix.* 2. And elsewhere I say, *It is lawful to be excited to a good thought by seeing a Death's-head, or any of Gods works, and so it is by seeing a Crucifix*; (which no sober Christian doubts of) he feigns me to make it an exciting sign to him that kneels before it.

§. 11. Yea he makes so much use of his own calumny as *p.* 354. to prove me *strangely partial, Allowing it to be lawful to pray before a Crucifix as a medium excitans, as an object that stirs up in us worshipping affections, and so excuse all Papists from Idolatry that profess they use a Crucifix for no other end.*

Answ. Meer repeated forgery, not becoming his profession. I never spake for praying before it, much less as an object to stir up worshipping affections: But only that I am not bound to fly at prayer from a room that hath only ornamental pictures; and that as in the *Geneva* Bible there be Historical pictures, and few but *Turks* are against them, it is lawful (I say not kneeling before them at prayer, but out of cases of scandal and danger) to be excited by them to good affections, and indeed good affections are worshipping affections. Dare any Christian say that it is a sin to think reverently of God when we see his works, or see but a picture of Scripture History (as *Abraham* offering *Isaac*, Christ dying and rising, &c.) Nonconformists have still taken them for Lyers that said they were against Historical pictures; and shewed is in the *Geneva* Bible. I have seen in many pious country Houses all the story of *Dives* and *Lazarus* painted over their Tables, and never heard the good use of it accused. But I desire the Reader to peruse my words, which he citeth, Quest. 113. and judge with what honesty we are accused. I there say, 1. *It is unlawful to make any Image of God.* 4. *It is unlawful to make, place or use an Image as is like to do more hurt than good, or to tempt to*

sin:

ſin: — *And all ſuch Images of creatures as others uſe to give unlawful worſhip or honour to, when like to tempt others to the like; as among the Papiſts the Image of the Crucifix, the Virgin* Mary *and Angels may not be made, placed or uſed ſo as may tempt any to worſhip them ſinfully as they do.* 11. *It is unlawful to place Images in Churches or in ſecret before our eyes when we are worſhipping God, when it tendeth to corrupt the mind — which is the ordinary effect of Images.* 12. *It is unlawful to uſe Images ſcandalouſly, as any of the aforeſaid ſinners uſe them, though we do it not with the ſame intent: that is, ſo as in outward appearance is the ſame with their uſe, Becauſe ſo we ſhall diſhonour God as they do, and harden them in ſin: Therefore Images in Churches or in Oratories in thoſe Countries where others uſe them ſinfully, or near ſuch Countries, where the ſame may harden men in their ſin, is evil.* 21. *I think it unlawful to make an Image or any equal inſtituted ſign to be the publick common ſymbol of the Chriſtian Religion, though but a profeſſing ſign (*as they make the Croſs.*)*

Doth this doctrine juſtifie the Papiſts? And p. 876. §. 14. I largly prove the uſe of a Crucifix (as they do the Croſs in baptiſm) to be unlawful: which he anſwereth not. Is it not conſiſtent with all this that I ſay, [*That it's not unlawful to pray before or towards an Image, in a room where Images are placed only for ornament, and we have no reſpect to them as a medium or object of our worſhip (except as by accident* it's made unlawful.) And that (not *kneeling to them*, nor in *prayer*, but, in tranſient meditation,) *it is lawful ſo to uſe them hiſtorically as to ſtir up in us a worſhipping affection.*] If the Papiſts do no more, no Proteſtant would call them Idolaters for it. But if they uſe them Idolatrouſly, it makes our uſe of them unlawful, when even but outwardly it is like theirs: And ſo I ſay of the Croſs. This is the Doctors zeal againſt Idolatry, that it ſeems would have us all uſed as his Books intimate, till we dare uſe the Tranſient Image of the Croſs much worſe than he maketh the Papiſts to uſe Images and Crucifixes in particular. For to uſe them as a *dedicating common badge of Chriſtianity, in our great Covenant with Chriſt*, is more than to uſe them *hiſtorically* and in *meditation*, or more than to pray in rooms adorned with common pictures. But he knoweth that the Papiſts give more to Images.

§. 12. Obj. *But what need had you to ſay all this of Images?*

Anſw. That men may underſtand it. I'le tell you that you may ſee the Candor of our accuſers. Dr. *R. Coxe* Biſhop of *Ely* conſulted with *Caſſander* to *have had Images in our Churches. The* Lutherans *ſo uſe them. Our new Church of* England *began to ſet up Crucifixes over Altars*, and to plead more for Church-pictures than heretofore. In 1642. the Parlia-

Parliament ordered the defacing all Images of any Perſon of the Trinity in Churches or Church-yards, (before the King went from them) Becauſe I read this Order and the Church-warden attempted to obey it, the rabble of drunken ſwearing Journy-men, who were all for Conformity, roſe in a tumult with clubs, ſeeking to kill me and the Churchwardens, and knockt down two Country-men becauſe they were our friends (who carried the hurt to their death:) And the Conforming Clergy were ſo much for them, that one of them indicted me at the Aſſizes, and I was forced to leave the Country. Such rage for Images tempted ſome religious men that were againſt them, to be more cenſorious againſt the Conformiſts than I would have them, and to run too near the other extream: And after it grew a diſpute whether the *Lutherans* were not Hereticks (of which ſee *Caſpar Streſo.*) The remembrance of all this drew me to ſay all the Truth which I thought uſeful to cure mens over-much cenſuring the *Lutherans* and the new Prelatiſts: And now the thanks they give me is to turn the cenſure on my ſelf for ſaying ſo much to excuſe them.

Juſt ſo did Mr. *Pierce* by me: My religious neighbours ſcrupled Communion with their neighbour Prelatiſts, ſaying, All the drunkards and ſwearers and ignorant ungodly people that had no religion, were fierce for Biſhops, Liturgy and Ceremonies, and they durſt not joyn with them while they profaned the Sacrament. I was far from juſtifying them, but to abate their overmuch cenſuring, I told them that in ſome Countries where cuſtome had brought ſome particular ſin from under diſgrace, we could not judge one graceleſs, whoſe whole lives elſe were pious, temperate and juſt, for ſometime committing that particular ſin; and it was hard to ſay how oft this might fall out: As breaking the Lords day in *Geneva* and *Holland*, ſome petty Oath in ſome Countries that uſe it, and ſuch like. For this charity to the Prelatiſts, what doth Mr. *Pierce* but turn the charge of favouring ſuch groſs ſin againſt my ſelf, as if I had been compounding it with godlineſs?

I leave you all therefore hereafter, better to defend your ſelves.

§. 13. About their *appointing the Croſs to work Grace morally, and that Sacraments work it not phyſically*, he ſaith, *I miſrepreſent or miſapply both the Popiſh and Proteſtant doctrine of Sacraments.*] And for the firſt he ſaith, *It overthrows all that I ſay that they all hold that Sacraments work grace, ex opere operato, where there is no actual impediment, and it's hereſie to ſay, They are bare outward profeſſing ſigns.*]

Anſw.

Answ. Did he think that this is inconsistent with the opinion that they *work it morally?* They distinguish between the Principal Agent, the instrumental Operator, and the Receiver. And they say that the Sacrament conveyeth Grace by the will of the Principal Agent (God) *ex opere operato*, and hath not its effect *ex opere operantis*; And that *opus operantis* is that which *vim habet ex bonitate & devotione ejus qui operatur*, that is, from the Ministers goodness (And doth not the *English* Canon say the same?) But *opus operatum* is that which is effectual, *modo fiat sicut lex præscribit*, whether the instrument be good or bad: But it must be *sicut lex præscribit*: And when they come to the Receiver they require in him more than the *opus operatum* to the effect: *viz.* that he intend (as *Aquinas* speaketh, 3. *q.* 68. *a.* 7.) *to receive Baptism, which is the beginning of a new life, and that he have faith, a.* 8. *c. ex parte gratiæ quam quis per baptismum consequitur, exigitur in suscipiente fides, ex parte vero Characteris non necessaria est.* The Character is received without real Faith, but Grace is not. And what that Character is how little they are agreed see at large in *Wotton de Reconcil. Peccat. Durandus*, and the wisest say it is but the *Relation* of one that hath received the external *tessera* or badge of Christianity (which none deny.) And ad 2. he saith, [*the Church quantum in se, non intendit dare baptismum nisi habentibus rectam fidem, sine qua non est remissio peccatorum. Et propter hoc interrogat accedentes ad baptismum an credant?* And citeth *Austin*, that without true faith it is not received to salvation.

And Art. 9. he concludeth that [*seeing God doth not compell men to righteousness, it's manifest that feigned comers obtain not the benefit of baptism.* And ad 3. *inter ficte accedentes, he numbers them that come in mortal sin, not willing to leave it and be conformed to Christ.*

And your own words imply all this, that the *Receiver must put no hinderance*] while they make the want of necessary *intention, desire, true faith, repentance*, to be the hinderance, leaving the subject uncapable of the Grace of the Sacrament of Baptism.

§. 14. It irketh me to repeat, but you constrain me: *Scotus* and *Okam* (and then I need not say how many more) confute *Aquinas* at large for calling Sacraments so much as instruments giving Grace, as he explaineth it; And so doth *Pet. Aliaco Camerar.* briefly in 4. *q.* 1. *B. C.* concluding that Sacraments are no Causes of Grace properly, but improperly, because *Deus in sacramentis ordinavit se agere, non quod ipsa sacramenta agant*——And that a *sacrament neither by its own virtue, nor by any virtue given it, is any proper efficient cause of any disposition*

tion in the ſoul previous to grace, or of grace it ſelf, but a condition ſine qua non, diſpoſitiv, improperly called *Cauſa diſpoſitiva Moralis, non effectiva ſed receptiva*: Yet they grant alſo a Moral objective cauſality, by ſignification.

Brianſon in 4. q. 1. *fol.* 6. concludeth (1. doc.) *ſacramenta non ſunt gratiæ cauſa effectiva, ſed ſolum per modum meriti per ea datur gratia*, citing *Ricardus, Scotus, Aureolus, Franc. Peruſius*, &c. againſt *Thom.* & *Alexand.* herein. Yet ſaith [*Baptiſmus indiget fide, quæ eſt diſpoſitio & fundamentum omnium ſacramentorum, vel in ſe ut in adultis, vel in alio ut in parvulis. Suarez de Legib. l. 5. c. 6. p. 748. Col. 2. de Circumcif.* [*Nam etiam ipſa fides parentum erat conditio neceſſaria & ſine qua non. Et ratio de illa dici non poteſt, Quod Gratiam daret Infanti ex opere operato, nec quod gratiam continuret; etiam nec cauſa juſtificans parvulos dici poteſt, niſi late & impropriè modo, ſicut dicitur de quolibet remedio vel conditione ſine qua non.*

And *Brianſon* alſo ſaith in 4. q. 4. *doc.* 1. *fol.* 34 *Quod ficte recipientes baptiſmum non habent gratiam baptiſmi, dicunt Scholaſtici.*

Yea even *Hildebrand* in one of his *Roman* Councils concludeth, that the Sacraments of Baptiſm and Penance give not pardon to the impenitent and uncapable.

Petrus à S. Joſeph Theſ. univerſ. de ſacram. p. 93. ſaith, [*Sacramentum eſt ſignum ſenſibile divinitus inſtitutum, longo tempore durans, ſanctitatem aliquam, ſaltem externam* (that is, Relative ſeparation to God, which is the true Character with them) *conferens, & veram ſignificans.*

And *p.* 101. [*Sacramenta novæ legis conferunt gratiam, idque ex opere operato & immediate: Duplicem ſcilicet, aliam reſpondentem diſpoſitioni, aliam ipſi ſacramento: cum antiqua adultis nullam conferrent miſi rationem diſpoſitionis——Sacramenta novæ legis non producunt gratiam phyſice, ſed tantum moraliter.*]

But I muſt ſpare the Reader: By this he may underſtand, 1. That they hold not to the *opus operatum* as efficient of Grace in the Sacraments of the old Law, and ſo not to Sacraments as Sacraments: 2. That they put *opus operatum* againſt *opus operantis*, and not againſt the neceſſary diſpoſition of the Receiver, which conſiſteth in Faith, Repentance, intention, &c.

3. That many of them deny all proper Sacramental cauſality of Grace. 4. Specially Phyſical. (And Proteſtants make them not *meer ſigns*, but *inveſting ſigns.*) 5. And *ponere obicem* is to want neceſſary moral qualification, and action as aforeſaid.

And now the Dr. had done well to tell me wherein I was very much *mistaken.*

§. 15. He next saith, [*The Cross is in no sense held to be an instrument appointed for conveying Grace.*]

Answ. 1. Not by God, for it is none of God's Ordinances. 2. But that by men it is I have manifested; if a *moral objective moving and teaching means* may be called an Instrument: If not, the word Instrument is nothing to our case. 1. To work on the soul of the adult by representation, signification, excitation (as the word doth) is to be an operative moral cause or means: And this the Church ascribeth to it (Pref. to Liturg. &c.). 2. The death of Christ, and the benefits of it, and reception into the Church and State of Christianity, and the sense of our Engagement to fight under Christ's banner, &c. are Grace; some of which is given by excitation and some (the Relation) by investiture.

§. 16. And now whether I have only *invented* these *objections to amuse and perplex mens consciences*, and this Dr. hath *made all so plain* that all may venture on it, and he and all Ministers may deny them Christendom that dare not venture, and cast out all from the Ministry that be not as bold as he, I leave to consideration.

He next turneth to Mr. *A.* about bowing, and so goeth to their Excommunication

CHAP.

CHAP. XL

Whether the Excommunicating Church, or the Excommunicated for not Communicating when Excommunicated be guilty of Schism?

§. 1. "Their Canons excommunicate ipso facto *all that say Conformity is unlawful*, and many such like. 1. He saith "*The excommunication is not against such as modestly scruple the lawfulness of things imposed, but those who obstinately affirm it.*

Answ. Reader, trust neither him nor me, but read the words. Can. 3, 4, 5, 6. "*Whosoever shall affirm that the Church of* England *by Law established under his Majesty is not a true and an Apostolical Church, — let him be excommunicated* ipso facto.

Whosoever shall affirm that the form of God's worship in the Church of England *established by the Law, and contained in the Book of Common-prayer —— is a corrupt, superstitious, or unlawful worship of God, or containeth ANY THING in it that is repugnant to the Scriptures, let him be excommunicated* ipso facto, *and not restored till, &c.*

Whosoever shall affirm that any of the 39 Articles, are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe unto, let him be excommunicated ipso facto, *and not restored till, &c.*

Whosoever shall affirm that the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England *by Law established are wicked, antichristian, or superstitious, OR such as being commanded by lawful authority, men who are zealously and Godly affected may not with any good conscience approve them, use them, OR as occasion requireth subscribe to them, let him be excommunicated* ipso facto, *and not restored till he repent and publickly revoke such his wicked errours.*

Can. 7. *Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that the Government of the Church of* England *under his Majesty by Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deans, Arch-Deacons, and THE REST THAT BEAR OFFICE IN the same, is antichristian, OR repugnant to the word of God, let him be excommunicate* ipso facto, *&c.*

Can. 8. *Whoſoever ſhall affirm that the form and manner of making and conſecrating Biſhops, Prieſts or Deacons, containeth ANY THING in it that is repugnant to the word of God,——let them be excommunicate* ipſo facto, *&c.*

Can. 11. *Whoſoever ſhall affirm—that there are within this Realm, other Meetings, Aſſemblies, or Congregations of the Kings born ſubjects, than ſuch as by the Law of this Land are held and allowed, which may rightly challenge to themſelves the Name of true and lawful Churches, let him be excommunicate* ipſo facto, *&c.*

And now if the Reader will no more believe the Doctor, it is not long of me. If all this be no more than to excommunicate them that [*obſtinately affirm the Ceremonies Antichriſtian, impious, or ſuperſtitious,*] underſtanding them is not poſſible.

§. 2. But I confeſs they excommunicate not men for ſecret thoughts: We thank them for nothing. It is but for telling their judgment. And Diſſenters may have many occaſions to tell it. The Kings Commiſſion once allowed ſome of us to tell it: The Demands, Accuſations, calumniating Books and Sermons, &c. may call many to it.

§. 3. He ſaith, *All Excommunication ſuppoſeth precedent Admonition.*

Anſw. 1. They ſhould do ſo: The worſe is yours becauſe it doth not ſo: It only alloweth admonition to repent for his reſtoration: which made *M. Anton. Spalatenſis* ſay ſo much againſt it.

2. If it did oblige you to admoniſh us, as you have done by your Books, you know that this changeth not our judgments: So that to be excommunicate before the admonition and after comes all to one. But indeed when the Law *ipſo facto* excommunicateth, the Law it ſelf is the admonition.

§. 4. He addeth [*General excommunications though they be* latæ ſententiæ, *do not affect the particular perſons till the evidence be notorious, not only of the bare fact, but the contumacy.*]

Anſw. Affecting is a word that ſignifieth what you pleaſe. *Ipſo facto* is [*for and upon the fact proved, without any ſentence of a judge.*] While the *fact* only is thus made the full cauſe, the contumacy need not be proved. It's true, 1. That the *fact* muſt be proved, 2. And then the Law is a ſentence and *Relatively affecteth the perſon as ſentenced*; 3. But no perſons elſe *are obliged to avoid him, till the fact be lawfully publiſhed.* But the man is *excommunicate.* And 4. Whether the man that knoweth the Law and his own Fact be not bound himſelf to avoid the Churches Communion, is a great Controverſie: And the plain truth is, If it be a juſt Excommunication, he is bound to forbear

Com-

Communion in obedience to it: (As much as a silenced Minister is to forbear Preaching.) But if it be a sentence unjust, and injustice be not so gross as to nullifie it, still he must forbear: But if it be so unjust as to be invalid, he may Communicate till he be executively rejected: (As one so unjustly silenced may preach, if he can: for the case is much like.)

The Reader would be displeased if I should cite him many Casuists in so plain a case.

2. But no man doubteth but the General sentence of the Canon speaketh the sence of the Church, and doth all that Law-makers can do, before judgment: And the Law is *norma officii & judicii*, obliging Subject and Judge.

§. 5. It's true that *Lindwood* saith, that a *Declaratory sentence*, that is, *A Declaration that such a man is already sentenced by the Law*, is necessary to oblige any to the execution of it on others, or the person in *foro externo*. But still the Church hath done her part in Legislation, to oblige as aforesaid.

§. 6. He saith [*Persons excommunicate are to be denounced so every six months, that others may have notice of them.*]

Answ. 1. But are they not excommunicate then, before they are so oft denounced, yea or at all, as far as aforesaid?

§. 7. He saith [*I have fully answered my own Objection by saying, I am not bound to execute the sentence on my self.*]

Answ. 1. He would not say that he approveth the answer: For if he do, he confuteth himself, that would have us execute the silencing sentence on our selves, and the sentence against publick worship in any way but theirs.

2. My reason is, because I take the unjust sentence as invalid: else I were bound *in foro interiore*.

3. But sure the Church at least relaxeth that mans obligation to present Communion, by shewing her will, if she did not oblige him to withdraw.

Read over the words of the Canon, and see whether they make them not as unintelligible and flexible to what sense they please, as they do the words of the Act of Uniformity and Liturgy.

§. 8. As to his two cases in which the excommunicate may be schismaticks for not communicating, 1. We question not the first: Just excommunication excludeth none but the guilty. Here then indeed is the state of our Controversie. Had he proved that in all the cases before cited, it is just to excommunicate us, he had done somewhat, when now for want of it he betrayeth his cause. 2. His

2. His 2d. is [*If they form new Churches.*]

Anſw. 1. *Is forming new Churches and not communicating with the old ones all one?* Our preſent queſtion is of the later. So that this great Accuſer ſeemeth plainly to *abſolve* all from being bound to Communicate with them, *who are unjuſtly excommunicate, and gather not new Churches.*

2. But may not the *unjuſtly excommunicate* that cannot on juſt terms be reſtored, worſhip God in ſome publick Church? Doth ſuch a wicked ſentence bind men to live like Atheiſts till death? or deprive them of their right to all God's Ordinances? even many Papiſt-Doctors and Councils ſay the contrary. And how elſe do you juſtifie the Church of *England* againſt the Papiſts charge of Schiſm?

§. 9. p. 372. He ſtill ſeemeth to think, that [*His own and others reaſonings may change all the truly honeſt Chriſtians in the Land to hold all the things impoſed lawful.*]

Anſw. Theſe thoughts of the Biſhops in 1660. and 1661. have brought us all to the paſs that we are at; And if after 20 years ſo great experience of the inefficacy of all their Diſputes, yea and Priſons, and after the notice of the nature and different caſes of men, they ſtill truſt to bring us to Concord on theſe terms, diſputing with ſuch men is in vain; The Lord deliver us from them.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Of the Engliſh *ſort of Sponſors, and the excluſion of Parents duty.*

§. 1. PAge 380. He ſaith I [*ſeveral times mention this as one of the grounds of the unlawfulneſs of the peoples joyning in Communion with us: yea as the greateſt objection.*]

Anſw. Four places of my writings are cited, and all will teſtifie to him that will read them, the untruth of the Doctors words. This is an unhappy courſe of accuſations: I can find no word of [*The unlawfulneſs of the peoples joyning in Communion with you on this ground.*] On the contrary, I have taught men how to make this very action in them lawful, *viz.* By getting if poſſible credible Sponſors of the old ſort, and agreeing with them to be the Parents Repreſenter, and promiſe as in his name, or at leaſt but as his ſecond, undertaking the Education of the Child if he *die* or *apoſtatize* (which was the old ſort:) and himſelf to be preſent and ſignifie his conſent by geſture, though he may not ſpeak.

But I have ſhewed, 1. That this muſt be done beſides the Churches order, that hath no ſuch thing. 2. That ſubſcribing to the Churches order herein is unlawful: 3. That the Church which refuſeth the Child lawfully offered, ought not to blame that perſon that cannot or will not make ſuch ſhifts, but getteth another Paſtor to Baptize him whom they ſinfully refuſe.

But this is not to prove it unlawful to have Communion with you. But it's lawful to uſe better alſo when they can, being thus repulſed by you.

§. 2. He ſaith [*The Parents are to provide ſuch as are fit to undertake that office.*]

Anſw. 1. No one is fit for it as uſed by the Liturgy, but an Adopter that taketh the Child for his own: For he undertaketh the Parents work. And it's *lis ſub judice*, whether any others undertaking beſides a Parent or Owner can prove the Child to be in the Covenant as offered, and have right to the ſeal and benefits: Atheiſts and Infidels Children are unholy, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.

2. If

2. If any were fit, few Parents can get ſuch, as will underſtandingly and deliberately and credibly promiſe them to do all that Godfathers muſt by the Liturgy undertake. I never knew one in my life that ſeemed to the Parent to mean any ſuch thing, much leſs to do it.

I have in my younger time been Godfather to three or four; But we before agreed with the Parents to intend no more than to be *Witneſſes*, and the Father to be the Entitler and the undertaker.

I did in 1640. Baptize two by the Liturgy, (without Croſſing) and never more in 6. or 7. years after, becauſe of the impoſed corruptions. Mr. *Kettilby* the Bookſeller (unleſs his Father had another Child of the ſame name baptized the ſame year) was one: But his Father gave him his name, and promiſed all his own duty, and his Uncle and Aunt ſtanding as Sponſors, we before agreed that they ſhould ſignifie but *Witneſſes* and friendly helpers in caſe of need.

2. But what if the Parents are *bid provide ſuch?* that is no diſcharge of their own part, nor are they bound to caſt their duty on others.

§. 3. He ſaith (as to the Childs *Right* to Baptiſm) *that the Godfathers ſtand* in a threefold capacity, 1. Repreſenting the Parent in offering, 2. Repreſenting the Child in promiſing, 3. In their own as undertakers of his education, &c.

Anſw. 1. I will not till he confute them repeat my proofs that in the Church of *England*'s ſence the Godfathers are not the Parents repreſentatives at all, nor ſpeak in their name.

2. If they were, then when the Parents both are Atheiſts, Infidels, Hobbiſts, ſcorners at Godlineſs, Hereticks, the Godfathers can repreſent them but as they are, and their own faith entitleth not the Child, becauſe they ſtand in the perſons of Atheiſts, Infidels, &c. your Church doth not like this doctrine.

3. And as to their repreſenting the Child, *quo jure* is the doubt, it cannot be done without ſome repreſenting power given them. And who gave it them?

4. And as to the third Perſon (in this multiform thing) the doubt is, whether their undertaking to educate another mans Child be lawful, while he is bound to do it himſelf? 2. And whether men uſe to be ſerious in ſuch undertakings, which I never knew one perform, nor ſeem to mean it, ſave ſuch as take *poor mens, kinſmens or dead mens children* to keep as their own. 3. And if it be done without ſerious intention, Is it not to make perjury or perfidiouſneſs, and prophane

taking

taking God's name in vain, to be the way of Chriſtening and Covenanting with Chriſt in order to ſalvation?

§. 4. This is a great point, and he doth well to handle it diligently: His explication of it is this, *p.* 382. [1. *The Church hath the power of the Keys,* (True; but not as he and the *Brownists* ſay, *The whole Church, but only the Paſtors.*)

[2. *They may baptize capable ſubjects.*] No doubt of it.

[3. *Infants are capable ſubjects.*]

Anſw. But what Infants? All, or ſome? Is this our ſatisfaction? If it be *All Infants*, then how come the Heathens Infants to be baptizable and have right, when the Parents have none? Then how great a deed of charity is it to bring an Army among them to baptize their Children by force? When even *Aquinas* and other Papiſts ſay, that Children may not be baptized againſt the Parents wills.

I have elſewhere at large proved, 1. That Baptiſm is but the ſealing of the Covenant, and the delivering of poſſeſſion by Miniſterial Inveſtiture, and not the firſt gift or condition of our right to Chriſt and his benefits.

2. That in the Adult faith and Repentance and heart-conſent are the Conditions, which Baptiſm after ſolemnly expreſſeth.

3. That if a true penitent believing conſenter die without Baptiſm, he is ſaved; and if the baptized adult die without faith, repentance and heart-conſent, he is damned.

4. That therefore all the adult muſt have an entitling condition, to give them right, firſt initially, *coram Deo*, to pardon of ſin, and then to be baptized (which ſolemnly delivereth their full right) before they can be lawfully baptized.

5. That God dealeth not ſo differently with Infants and Adult, as to require conditions of right in the later, and none in the former, as if they were all born with right.

6. That the Covenant is made to the faithful and their ſeed, and that Infants condition of right is that they be children of believers: And that if both Parents be Infidels, the Children are unclean, but elſe they are holy. And God that confoundeth not the Church and the World, confoundeth not their Childrens caſe.

This I have fully proved in my Diſp. of Original ſin, and Treat. of right to Sacraments.

7. That Baptiſm ſealeth and delivereth to the qualified ſubject, the preſent pardon of ſin, and right to Chriſt and life as to adopted Children of God. And therefore there muſt be ſome reaſon and

proof of a right to it, more than all Infants in the world have.

8. That it is not a mans bringing them to baptism and speaking feignedly in their name, that giveth them right to a sealed pardon and salvation: It must be one that can prove himself entitled to represent the Child, which none can that cannot say *He is my own.*

9. If it were otherwise, Atheists, Infidels, wicked men, though Baptized, could give no right to the sealed pardon, or to the Investiture in a state of life, to which they have no right themselves. And if they represent no better Parents, as such they can give them no right, save *coram Ecclesia* when they are not *infideles judicati.*

10. Nor doth it suffice to an Infants right, that the Minister, or Church, be Christians.

Therefore to tell us that *Infants are right subjects*, signifieth nothing, till either, 1. He tell us what Infants, 2. Or prove that all Infants have right; which he can never do: And if he could, I would easily prove that all dying infants are saved, whether Baptized or not; As I can prove that true Christian Infants are.

§. 5. While he gives us not the least satisfaction of Infants Right, he tells us of *difficulties* on the other side; if we lay it on Parents (or Owners) right. And 1. He tells us of divers mens Opinions; which the Reader will be loth I should digress to try, having done it so largly in my Christ. Direct. and Treat. of *Right* to [illegible]*raments.*

2. He nameth the qualification which I assert, [*A profession of the Christian faith not invalidated*] and saith nothing to disable it, but that *Others* will reject it. Others wild Opinions named, goes for my Confutation.

And now I desire the Reader to see the Catalogue of the things we account sinful in Conformity in my first Plea for Peace, and try how many of them the Doctor hath so much as meddled with: And whether he think by these few touches he hath proved either our Conformity lawful, or our Preaching unlawful, or our Communion with those Christians who are not of his mind herein unlawful.

If he say again, that he meddleth not with Ministers Conformity but the Peoples, 1. Note, how he hath passed by even the greatest things also in their case. 2. Whether he meddle not with the Ministers case who seeketh to prove their preaching unlawful, and so perswades them to be silent. 3. Whether their case should not be so far meddled with, as to *prove* the things which they think sinful to be lawful, or their preaching unnecessary; before the *endeavours* used against them (well known) be justified as needful to the Churches Peace.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the three French *Letters which he ſubjoyneth.*

§. 1. WHat advantage to the Drs. Cauſe the three Letters of the *French* Divines annexed, can be to any that will not be decoyed by meer ſounds and ſhews, I know not: But could we know theſe things following, we might better underſtand the judgment of the Writers.

Queſt. 1. Whether he that ſought their judgment did make them underſtand what all our preſent Impoſitions and Acts of Conformity are? and what alterations are made in the Church of *England* ſince the beginning of Biſhop *Laud's* power?

2. Whether he made them truly underſtand the difference between the ancient Epiſcopacy, and the *Engliſh Diocеſan* frame in all its parts?

3. Whether he did put the Caſe as about Subſcribing or Declaring, Covenanting or Swearing, Aſſent and Conſent to all things, and practiſing accordingly? or only of living in Communion with them which do ſuch things?

4. Whether he put the caſe as of denying active Communion in the practice of unlawful things; or as denying Communion in the reſt which are lawful?

5. Whether he made them underſtand that we are *ipſo facto* excommuncate by their Canon for telling our judgment?

6. Whether he made them underſtand that it was about 2000 Miniſters that were ſilenced, and what men are in many of their places? and what claim their ancient Flocks lay to many of them; and what men they are, and what they did to prevent all our diviſions?

7. Whether he made them underſtand what meaſure of Communion we ſtill maintain with the Church of *England* and the Pariſh Churches?

8. Whether he put the caſe to them, whether we that have Communion with them are Schiſmaticks, if we alſo have Communion with others whom they proſecute?

9. Whether he put the queſtion to them, whether we are lawfully ſilenced? and if not, whether *rebus ſic ſtantibus* we are bound to forbear our Miniſtry?

10. Whether he made them know that all the Miniſters of *England* as well as we were forbidden to Preach, &c. unleſs they would Conform to that we are ready to prove unlawful? And if it prove ſo, whether they ſhould all either have ſinned or been ſilent in obedience?

11. Whether he made them underſtand how many thouſands there be in *London* that cannot have room in the Pariſh-Churches and the Nonconformiſts Churches ſet together, but live like Atheiſts.

12. Whether he acquainted them that the queſtion is, whether all godly diſſenters that are caſt out, or cannot joyn in the Pariſh way of Liturgick Worſhip, muſt (till their judgments change) give over all publick worſhip of God, and be forſaken of all Teachers?

13. Whether he acquainted them, how loud a Call we had to preach in *London*, firſt by the Plague, & then by the burning of the Churches, the people being deſerted by the Pariſh Miniſters in theſe ſad extremities?

14. Whether he acquainted them with the Kings Licences, and our being accuſed of Schiſm, even when Licenſed?

15. Whether he acquainted them with what we have ſaid for our ſelves lately in divers Books; or they judg'd us unheard?

16. Whether they be ſingular? or whether it be the judgment of the Proteſtant Churches in *France*, that it is a ſin for any to preach or publickly worſhip God, when the King, Biſhops and Law forbid them? And if ſo, How long it hath been their judgment? and why all their Churches ceaſed not when prohibited?

If not ſo, How to know that our ſilencing Laws and Biſhops muſt be obeyed, and not theirs?

There is no underſtanding their anſwers, till we know how the caſe was ſtated.

§. 2. Mr. *Clodes* Letter is moderate, and it's like they took the caſe to be about proper ſeparation, and ſo ſay no more in the main than ſome Nonconformiſts have ſaid againſt the *Browniſts*. But the Dr. hath dealt too unmercifully with Mr. *Le Meine* in publiſhing his Epiſtle, when it was ſo eaſie to know how few, if any, would believe his ſtory, but take it for a confirmation, how incredible our accuſers are? I mean his ſtory that [*five years ago he heard one of the moſt famous Nonconformiſts preach in a place where were three men, and three or fourſcore women: he had choſen a Text about the building up the ruins of* Jeruſalem, *and for explication cited* Plinny *and* Vitruvius *a hundred times, &c.*] I think I ſhall never ſpeak with the perſon that will believe him: ſure I am, *London* knoweth that the Nonconformiſts are the moſt averſe to ſuch kind of Preaching. And I know not one of them that I can ſay ever

read

read a quarter of *Vitruvius*: I confeſs I never read a leaf of him. This Monſieur would do well to tell us yet the name of the man, that if living he may be call'd to account: But I doubt he fell into ſome Tabernacle, of which many are erected in place of the burnt Churches, and perhaps heard the Conformiſt who had occaſion to talk of architecture? But yet I will not believe that either Conformiſt or Nonconformiſt would expoſe himſelf to common ſcorn by an hundred or twenty ſuch citations.

§. 3. And his deſcription of the mens *horrible impudence to excommunicate without mercy the Church, &c. imagining that they are the only men in* England, *nay in the Chriſtian world that are predeſtinated to eternal happineſs, &c. and then pronouncing them intolerable*, ſheweth that it is not us that he ſpeaketh of, nor any company that is known to us, neither our Separatiſts here, nor Anabaptiſts, nor ſo much as the very Quakers holding any ſuch thing.

§. 4. And though he ſaith [*He was not at all edified* by the Nonconformiſts preaching, it followeth not that no others are: Nor that none were edified in *England* or *Scotland*, while publick Preachers went the Nonconformiſts way.

§. 5. But becauſe the Doctor chuſeth this way, I will imitate him, though with the Apology that St. *Paul* gloried, and give him notice of ſome Epiſtles of men that judged otherwiſe of the Nonconformiſts.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

Epiſtles or Teſtimonies compared with the Doctors, And notes on Mr. Joſeph Glanvile's *Book, called The* Zealous Impartial Proteſtant, *with a Letter of his to the Author heretofore (and a Digreſſion of Doctor* L. Moulin.)

§. 1. IN general, he that will read the Lives of many of the old Nonconformiſts (*Hilderſham*, *Dod*, and many ſuch, and Biſhop *Hall*'s Character of Dr. *Reynolds*, and the late publiſhed Lives of Mr. *Joſeph Allen*, *John Janeway*, Dr. *Winter*, Mr. *Macham*, Mr. *Wadſworth*, Mr. *Stubbs*, *&c.*) will ſee better what to judge of them, than by our three *French* Epiſtles. Yea *Thuanus* giveth a juſter Character of many abroad that were of their mind: And *John Fox* (one of them) of more.

§. 2. And to our three *French-men*, I will when it will be of more uſe than *ſeeming vanity*, return you four *French-mens* Letters to my ſelf, (Mr. *Gachet*, Mr. *Amyralds*, Mr. *Le Blanks*, and Mr. *Teſtards*, (and if you will ſome *Germans* too, *Calviniſts* and *Lutherans*,) of a quite differing ſenſe of us Nonconformiſts. But Mr. *Gachet* being already in Print (by the Duke of *Lauderdales* means) 1660. and joyned with one of Mr. *L' Angles*, I leave the Reader that deſireth to ſee both.

§. 3. But becauſe Mr. *Joſ. Glanvile* was one of themſelves here (though an Origeniſt) a moſt triumphant Conformiſt, and not the gentleſt contemner of Nonconformiſts, and famous for his great wit, I will repay the Dr. with the annexing one (among many ſince) of his Letters to my ſelf; which yet indeed I do not chiefly to ballance the Drs. but to help the Reader to underſtand Mr. *Glanvile* and his poſthumous Book, which I think not meet to paſs by without ſome Animadverſions.

Though I have great reaſon to hope that dying ſo ſoon after it and his preferment, the experience of the Vanity of a flattering World might help to ſave him from Impenitence: As I have read in divers credible writers, it was with Dr. *Matthew Sutliffe*; that on his Death-bed

bed he repented that he had written so much against the Reformers called *Puritans*.

I perceive Dr. *Stillingfleet* marvelleth, that my own expectations of approaching Death do not hinder me from writing what I do for the Nonconformists; whereas the truth is, had not pain and weakness kept me from my youth as in the continual prospect of the Grave and the next life, I had never been like to have been so much against Conformity, and the present Discipline of this Church (that is, their want of Discipline) as I have been; For the World might have more flattered me and byassed my Judgment, and my Conscience might have been bolder and less fearful of sin; And, though I love not to displease them, I must say this great truth, that I had never been like to have lived in so convincing sensible experience of the great difference of the main body of the Conformists from the most of the Nonconformists, as to the seriousness of their Christian Faith, and hope and practice, their victory over the flesh and world, &c. I mean both in the Clergy and Laity of mine acquaintance! O how great a difference have I found, from my youth to this day? Though I doubt not but very many of the Passive Conformable Ministers (to say nothing of the Imposers) have been and are worthy pious men; and such as would not perswade their hearers, that the *Jesuits first brought in spiritual prayer*: And I had the great blessing of my Education near some such, in three or four neighbour Parishes.

§. 4. It grieved me to hear of Mr. *Glanvile's* death, for he was a man of more than ordinary ingeny, and he was about a Collection of Histories of Apparitions, which is a work of great use against our Sadducees, and to establish doubters, and the best mans faith hath need of all the helps from sense that we can get: And I feared lest that work had perished with him; But I gladly hear that by the care of Dr. *H. More* (that worthy faithful man of peace, who never studied preferment) it is both preserved and augmented.

And as for his Origenisme, as I like it not, so I confess in matters of that nature, I can better bear with the venturousness of dissenters, than hereticators can do.

But when I saw this Rag called a Letter left behind him, my grief for him was doubled: And I saw what cause we have all to fear the snares of a flattering world, and what cause to pray for Divine preservation, and for an unbyassed mind, and a humble sense of our own frailty, that we may neither over-value *prosperity*, nor our own *understanding*.

I did

I did not think that he that had wrote the *Vanity of Dogmatizing* could ſo ſoon have come to perſwade men in power, that diſſenting from our *Churches dogmatizing and impoſed words, formes and ceremonies* was worthy of ſo ſevere a proſecution of us, as he deſcribeth: and that all their danger is from the forbearing ſuch proſecution of us; and that (though for their own ends he could abate us ſome little matters) the only way to ſettled peace is vigorouſly to execute the Laws againſt us.

He that can think the ſilencing, and impriſoning of about 2000 ſuch Miniſters, is the way to bring this Land to Concord, hath ſure very hard thoughts of them in compariſon of Conformiſts. And that you may ſee how little his judgment againſt ſuch ſhould weigh with others, who is ſo lately changed from himſelf, I will give you here one of ſeveral Letters which I had from him, and leave you to judge whether he have proved that he was much wiſer at laſt than when he wrote this? or whether his character of me agree with his motion to ſilence and ruine all ſuch? I am ſo far from owning his monſtrous praiſes, that I fear I offended him with ſharply rebuking him for them. But leſt his wit and virulence here do harm, I give it you to ſhew the unconſtancy of his judgment: or if he would have *excepted me* from his ſeverities, I muſt profeſs that *I believe the moſt of the Nonconformable Miniſters of my acquaintance are better men than my ſelf*; and therefore his exceſſive praiſe of me, is the condemnation and ſhame of his perſecuting counſel.

§. 3. As to his praiſe of the Biſhops Writings againſt Popery, I had rather magnifie than obſcure their deſerts: But I am not able to believe that the old ones who write to prove the Pope Antichriſt, &c. and the new ones who would bring us to obey him as Patriarch of the Weſt and *principium unitatis Catholicæ*, were of one mind, becauſe both are called Proteſtants, and that ſuch as Biſhop *Bramhall* and the reſt of the defenders of *Grotius*, were of the ſame judgment with Biſhop *Uſher*, Biſhop *Morton*, Biſhop *Downame*, *&c.* nor that *Grotius*, who deſcribeth a Papiſt to be *one that flattereth Popes as if all were right which they ſaid and did*, did diſclaim Popery in the ſame ſenſe as the old Church of *England* did. Two men may cry down Popery, while one of them is a Papiſt or near one in the others ſenſe.

As to the folly of calling that Popery which is not, I have ſaid more againſt it in my Cath. Theologie than he hath done.

And as to his excuſe of an ignorant vicious ſort of Miniſters becauſe no better will take ſmall Livings,] It is not true: The ſilenced Noncon-

Nonconformists would have been glad of them, or to have preached there for nothing: The tolerating of ignorant scandalous men were more excusable, if better were not shut out that would have taken such places. But it's notorious that for the interest of their faction and prosperity, they had rather have the ignorant and vicious, than the ablest and most laborious Nonconformist: Bishop *Morley* told me, when he forbad me to preach, that *It was better for a place to have none, than to have me*; when I askt him, *Whether I might not be suffered in some place which no one else will take.*] Most of the old Nonconformists were suffered by connivance in small obscure places, which was the chief reason why they set not up other meetings, which Dr. *Stillingfleet* thought they avoided as unlawful, because forbidden.

§. 6. And as to his excuse by blaming ill Patrons, I would know then by what true obligation all men in *England* are bound to commit the Pastoral conduct of their Souls to such men only as our *English* Patrons chuse?

§. 7. And when he so blameth the tepidity and irreligiousness of the Members of their own Church, I would know, 1. Whether all men that are more seriously religious must be forsaken by us, and ruined by them, if they be not of their mind and form? 2. And whether the numbers of the irreligious that are for their way, and the numbers of the religious that are against it, should not rather breed some suspicion in them, than engage them to ruine so many such men.

§. 8. And when *page 5.* he confesseth that the *sword is their Churches strength and Government*, and how contemptible *words, paper, argument and excommunications are without force*; doth he not shame their whole cause, and shew that it is not the same Government which the Church used for many hundred years, which they desire? and that their whole power of the Keys which they talk so much for, seems to themselves a dead and unessectual thing? while we Nonconformists desire no coercive power, but to guide Consenters.

§. 9. As to his project to save religion under a Papist King, if the Dean and Chapter may but chuse the Bishop, I leave it to other [illegible] consideration.

But I give you his Letter to me, because *page 34.* He saith, [*The greatest part of those that now scamper and run about do it out of Humour or Fancy, or Faction, or Interest, or Animosity, or desire of being counted godly, not really out of Conscience and Conviction of duty; and those the penalties duly exacted would bring back* (with much more sharp

 and

and cruel) As if he knew the consciences of the most: But see how much otherwise he lately thought of some.

Agapetus Diacon. ad Justinian. Adhort. cap. 35. [*Episcopis vi & gladio invitos regentibus quam Regibus magis congrua.*]

NOMIZE τὸν βασιλεύειν ἀσφαλῶς, ὅταν ἐκόντων ἀνδρῶν ἄρχῃς καὶ ἀνθρώπων, &c. *Existima tunc regnare te tutò, cum volentibus imperas hominibus. Quod enim invitò subjicitur, seditiones molitur, captâ occasione. Quod verò vinculis benevolentiæ tenetur, firmam servat erga tenentem observantiam.*

1 Pet. 5. 1, 2, 3, 4. *The Elders which are AMONG you I exhort, who am also an Elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the Glory that shall be revealed; Feed the Flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint but willingly; Not for FILTHY LUCRE, but of a ready mind: Neither as being Lords over Gods heritage, but being ensamples to the Flock; And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a Crown of Glory that fadeth not away.*] See Dr. *Hammond* on the Text.

Mr. Glen-

Mr. *Glanviles* Letter.

Reverend and most Honoured Sir,

'I Have often taken my pen in hand with a design to signifie to you, how much I love and honour so much learning, piety, and exemplary goodness as you are owner of; And how passionately desirous I have been, and am, to be known to a person with whom none hath a like place in my highest esteem and value: But my affections and respects still growing infinitely too big for mine expression, I thought I should but disparage them, by going about to represent them. And when I sate down to consider, how I might most advantagiously set forth my regards, and high sense of your great deserts, I always found my self confounded with subject. And the throng of mine affections, each of them impatient to be first upon my paper, hindred one another's gratification. Great passions are difficultly spoken: And I find my self now so pained with the sense that I cannot write suteably to the honour I have for you, that I can scarce forbear throwing away my pen; being near concluding, that 'tis better to speak nothing in such a subject, than a little. But when I consider you as a person that have high affections for those excellent qualifications, which in the highest degree are your possession, and suteably resent the worth of those that own them; I am incourag'd to think that you may conceive how I honour you (though my pen cannot tell it you) by reflecting upon your own estimate of those, that are of the highest form of learning, parts, and exemplary piety; or, more compendiously, such in your judgment, as I take you for, Incomparable. And yet I have a jealousie that that will not reach it; for though I think your judicious esteem of such, cannot be surpassed; yet I am apt to think, that none ever got such an interest, and hold upon your passions, as hath the object of my admiration, on mine. Nor yet can I rebuke them as extravagant, though at the highest, since they take part with my severest judgment, and were indeed inflamed by it. And I profess, I never found my self so dearly inclin'd to those of my neerest blood, or so affectionately concern'd for my most beloved friends and acquaintance, as for you, whom I had never the happiness to converse with but in your excellent writings, nor ever often

'often ſaw, but in the Pulpit. Yea, I ſpeak unfeignedly, I have al-
'ways intereſſed my ſelf more in your vindication when your unrea-
'ſonable prejudic'd enemies have malign'd you, and delighted my
'ſelf more in your juſt praiſes from thoſe that know you, than ever
'my ſelf-love or ambition could prompt me to do in any caſe of
'mine own. Sir, I hope you believe that I ſpeak my moſt real ſenti-
'ments, and do not go about to complement you. For I muſt be very
'weak and inconſiderate, did I think to recommend my ſelf to ſo much
'ſerious wiſdom, by ſuch childiſh fooleries. Therefore if my expreſ-
'ſions ſavour any thing above common reſpect, I beſeech you to be-
'lieve, 'tis for that their cauſe is not common; but as much above
'ordinary, as their object. I know your humility and remarkable
'ſelf-denyal will not bear to read, what I cannot but ſpeak, as of-
'ten as I have occaſion to mention your great worth and merits. How-
'ever I cannot chuſe but here acknowledge, how much I am a debtor
'to your incomparable writings. In which, when you deal in practi-
'cal ſubjects, I admire your affectionate, piercing, heart-affecting
'quickneſs: And that experimental, ſearching, ſolid, convictive way
'of ſpeaking, which are your peculiars; for there is a ſmartneſs ac-
'companying your pen that forces what you write into the heart, by
'a ſweet kind of irreſiſtable violence; which is ſo proper to your ſe-
'rious way, that I never met it equal'd in any other writings. And
'therefore I cannot read them without an elevation, and emotions
'which I ſeldom feel in other peruſals. And when you are ingag'd in
'doctrinal and controverſal matters, I no leſs apprehend in them your
'peculiar excellencies. I find a ſtrength, depth, concinnity, and cohe-
'rence in your notions, which are not commonly elſewhere met with-
'all. And you have no leſs power by your triumphant reaſon upon
'the judgments of capable, free inquirers; than you have upon their
'affections and conſciences in your devotional and practical diſcour-
'ſes. And methinks there is a force in your way of arguing, which o-
'verpowers oppoſition. Among your excellent Treatiſes of this na-
'ture, your Rational confirmation of that grand principle of our Re-
'ligion, the Sacred Authority of Scripture; your ſolid dependent no-
'tions in the buſineſs of juſtification, and your ſtriking at the Root of
'Antinomianiſm in them, which I look on as the canker of Chriſtiani-
'ty, and have always abhorr'd as the ſhadow of death; And your ex-
'cellent Catholick, healing indeavours; Theſe I ſay, deſerve from
'me particular acknowledgments. I profeſs the looſe, impertinent,
'unſound, cobweb arguings of the moſt that I had met with in the

'Mat-

'Matter of the Divine Authority of Scripture, had almoſt occaſioned
'my ſtumbling at the threſhold, in my inquiries into the grounds of
'my Religion. For I am not apt to rely on an implicit faith in things
'of this moment. But your performances in this kind brought relief
'to my ſtaggering judgment, and triumph't over my heſitancy. As
'they did alſo to an excellent perſon a friend of mine, who was ſha-
'ken on the ſame accounts that I was. And we are both no leſs ob-
'liged by what you have done in the other things formentioned. Which
'I profeſs I judge ſo rational, that I cannot but wonder, almoſt to
'ſtupor, to behold the fierce, though feeble onſets of your canker'd
'fiery opponents; whoſe writings againſt you (moſt of them) ſeem
'to me to be indited by nothing but ſpleen and choler. Nor have I
'been able to aſcribe the ingaging of ſo many virulent pens againſt
'you, to any other cauſe than the indeavours of Satan to hinder the
'ſucceſs which your powerful pen hath had againſt the Dark Kingdom.
'And the ſpirit that I have perceiv'd to animate ſome of their wild
'ravings hath confirm'd me in that belief, that it was the great *Abad-*
'*don* that inſpir'd their undertakings. I thought e're this to have gi-
'ven you a more publick ſpecimen of mine affections by indeavour-
'ing ſomewhat in your vindication againſt the calumnies, and feeble
'arguings of ſome of thoſe fiery Aſſailants; But collateral occaſions,
'and other ſtudies have hitherto diverted me: Yet I ſhall not forget
'my obligations, aſſoon as I can be maſter of convenient time and
'opportunities for the performance. But I ſee my paper warns me;
'And though *I* ſhould pleaſe my ſelf by a larger expreſſion of my re-
'ſpects, and ſenſe of your high deſervings from every one that hath
'had the happineſs to be taught by you, either from the Preſs or Pul-
'pit; yet *I* dare not be ſo rude in this firſt Addreſs, as to be trou-
'bleſome and importunate. *I* know your occaſions are ſuch, as that
'they cannot bear a long divertiſement. I had ſeveral times deſign'd
'at *London* to have taken the boldneſs to have waited on you, but the
'conſideration, how you were conſtantly ingag'd in buſineſs, prevent-
'ed the execution of thoſe intentions. And about three years ſince
'I came from *Oxford* on purpoſe to *Kederminſter*, to ſee you there,
'and hear you preach; both which I was happy in. But you were then
'ſo buſie in the company of ſeveral Miniſters that were at your houſe,
'that I could not gain an opportunity of making way for a future ac-
'quaintance. If I were ſure that you were leſs incumbred now, and
'that you made any conſiderable ſtay in the Country, I would make a
'journey on purpoſe to wait on you. I have with this ſent you a ſmall

'Diſ-

'Diſcourſe of mine own, of which I deſire your acceptance. For the 'ſubject and deſign, I know it will not diſpleaſe you. And for the 'management, I'me confident you will not quarrel with it, becauſe it 'is not ſo popular as it might have been, when you ſhall know, that 'twas 'intended for thoſe of a Philoſophick Genius. I durſt not (Sir) be 'any longer troubleſome, and therefore ſhall conclude with this pro-'feſſion, that the freedom of your ſpirit, the impartiality of your in-'quiries, the Catholickneſs of your judgment and affections, the 'peaceableneſs, and moderation of your principles, the generoſity 'and publick ſpiritedneſs of your diſpoſition, the exact, uniform ho-'lineſs of your life, and your indefatigable induſtry for the good of 'ſouls, excellencies which I never knew ſo combin'd in one, have ſo 'endear'd you to me, that there is not that perſon breathing that hath 'ſuch a ſhare in the affections, and higheſt value of,

Moſt excellent Sir,
one of the meaneſt, though moſt ſincere,
of your affectionate lovers, and admirers,

Sept. 3. 61.

Joſ. Glanvill.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

Some Notes on the Book called the Lively Picture *of Dr.* Lud. Moulin; *and his Repentance subscribed by Dr.* Simon Patrick, *Dean of* Peterborough, *and Dr.* Gilb. Burnet.

§. 1. I Had taken no notice of this Book, had not the Author by citing my words against Dr. *L. Moulin* as justifying his Character, made me a party. Therefore I shall impartially speak my judgment of him and the accusation, lest I be thought to own all that the Writer speaketh of him, and so to be as guilty of uncharitableness as he seemeth to me to be. I honour the name for the sake of his famous Father, and his worthy Brother *Peter*, yet living, who by his Answer to *Philanax Anglicus*, &c. hath well deserved of all Protestants: And his worthy Brother *Cyrus*, and his very worthy Son now dead: And I truly believe that Dr. *Lewis* was a sincere honest-hearted man, though Dr. *Stillingfleet* seem to dislike my giving him that title. And I will tell you why I think so.

§. 2. I ever observed that his faults lay in his *weakness*, and not in *wickedness*: 1. He was not a man of an accurate distinguishing head, and so was apt to take verbal Controversies for real. 2. And it was no singular thing in him, that hereby he was led by the authorities which he most valued, to think that the differences between the Remonstrants and Contra-remonstrants were much greater than they are, and *Arminianism* as it was called, to be a more heinous thing than indeed it is. 3. And when he thought that God's Cause (as *Bradwardine* called it) was so deeply engaged against such Opinions, who can wonder if he was zealous against them? 4. And then he had a *hasty rashness* in speaking what he thought was true and necessary, when sometimes it was not well tryed, and sometime it was in an imprudent manner and time: And so in his hast ran into the temerities and mistakes which Mr. *Daillé* and I did blame him for. But I never perceived that he had more *passion* (much less *fury*) than other ordinary disputers, but a more rash and blustering way of uttering his mind, sometimes and in some Cases, where he thought Religion much concerned. He had so fervent a love to truth, that he sometime rushed upon mistakes

that

that wore the vizor of it, and then truth (real or supposed) whatever it cost him he would speak. 5. I ever observed it was in his too extreme opposition to some real errour or crime, that he was carried into his temerities. 6. And I never found that he was a worldling, nor sinned by the preference of worldly interest; And doubtless the love of worldly profits, honours and pleasures, are more dangerously contrary to the love of God, than some rash uncharitable words and censures in a Cause which he thought was Gods.

§. 3. Yea I found him more patient of confutation, contradiction and reproof than most men that ever I disputed with, his Zeal which you call *fury* being far more for God than for himself. I began with him about 24 years ago, confuting his Latine Book of Justification against his Brother *Cyrus*. I wrote a second time against him in the Preface cited by his Picture-drawer, about Universal Redemption, (and had said much more in a Book of Universal Redemption, going to the Press, which I cast by because Mr. *Daillés* came then out, which had the same testimonial part and more which I intended.) Yet I never heard that the Dr. gave me any uncivil or uncharitable word, nor did he ever reply to either of these Books; nor signified any abatement of his love. And I think this shewed a forgiving mind.

§. 4. But it's intimated, that this was because we agreed in other things? I answer, we disagreed also even about Church-Government, which was the dividing Controversie of those times. The Dr. was zealous for the Magistrates Power in *Erastus* sense, and went rather further than Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his *Irenicum*! And as I was before against him, so after this, about 12 years ago, I wrote that Book against him about the Magistrates Power in Church-matters, in which I called him *My sincere friend*, thinking *sincere friendship* consistent with such a difference and an open Confutation. (And if the contrary must be repented of, I hope such charity is no crime.) This third Book against him also he took patiently, and without breach of Love.

And when I laboured to perswade him to retract his Writings against Excommunication, though he held still to his Conclusion, and thought that the great work that God called him to in the World, was to discover the Papal and Prelatical Usurpation of the Magistrates power under the name of Ecclesiastical, yet I made him confess all the matter that I pleaded for, and he made me see that his [illegible] lay most in meer ambiguous words, which he had not [illegible] enough to explicate. All this patience signified not uncharitableness, [illegible] or fury. And I obliged him not by [illegible]

him

him for his eagerneſs for his own indigeſted conceptions; nor gave him any thanks for his indiſcreet and exceſſive praiſes afterwards given me in his *Patronus bona fidei*. Upon all this I would put ſome queſtions to the ſober thoughts of the Author of his Picture.

1. Whether there be not as great ſigns of *ſincerity*, *humility* and *patience* in ſuch a behaviour, and in that great love which he had to all that he thought Godly men, (though he too hardly judged of others for that which he thought great errour and ſin) as in thoſe that cannot bear a juſt defence of diſſenters againſt their unjuſt accuſations, nor endure men to tell why they rather ſuffer than Conform.

2. Whether he that maketh him ſo very bad a man * and incredible a lyar for too raſh cenſoriouſneſs of diſſenters, and ſome untruths vented in raſh zeal, do not tempt men to give as odious titles to thoſe Reverend perſons who go very far beyond him in untruths and uncharitable cenſures? And whether they that were for the ſilencing and utter ruining of about 2000 Miniſters, and call'd to Magiſtrates to execute the Laws againſt them, and that unchurch all the Reformed Churches which have not a continued ſucceſſion of Dioceſan Biſhops, ſhew not as much uncharitableneſs as he did that deſcribed ſome too hardly? And whether moſt of the Books written againſt me by Conformiſts, (ſuch as the Biſhop of *Worceſter*'s Letter, the *Impleader*, Mr. *Hinkley*, and many more) be not much fuller of untruths in matter of fact than the Drs? But yet I think it a ſin to give them ſuch a Character as this, and render the perſons as *incredible lyars*, becauſe errour, intereſt and faction made ſome ſo unadviſed.

* *Page* 22. A vain Writer and malicious, if not mad and diſtracted. *p.* 11. he will magnifie the very worſt of men, if they be of his mind, and vilifie the beſt if they be of another. *p.* 27. He hath full liberty to vie with the Devil himſelf in his Calumnies: with more ſuch.

3. If it deſerve ſuch a Character to cenſure *Arminians* as dangerouſly erroneous and befriending Popery? whether you do not conſequently ſo ſtigmatize the old Church of *England*, before Biſhop *Laud*'s time? Even Arch-biſhop *Whitgift*, Biſhop *Fletcher*, and the reſt who drew up the *Lambeth* Articles, Arch-biſhop *Abbot* and the Church in his time (except ſix Biſhops, &c.) King *James*, and the whole Church as conſenting by ſix Delegates to the Synod of *Dort*: And alſo that Synod and all the Forein Reformed Churches that conſented to it? And is not this more than Dr. *Moulin* did?

4. And are they not then to be accordingly ſtigmatized, who on the other ſide make the *Calviniſts* as odious, accuſing them of Blaſphe-

my, Turciſme, and doing as much againſt them as Dr. *Heylin* in the Life of Arch-biſhop *Laud* tells us was done in *England* on that account.

5. And if ſuch hard thoughts of *Arminians* as furthering Popery deſerve your Character, whether by conſequence you ſo brand not all thoſe Parliaments who voted againſt it accordingly, and made it one of the dangerous grievances of the Land? And is not that as faulty as for Dr. *Moulin* too much to blame you?

6. Yea I doubt you ſtigmatize thus ſo great a part of Chriſtians in all the World as I am loth to mention: ſo rare is it to hear of any Country, where they are not ſo much guilty of ſects and factions, as by education and intereſt to run in a ſtream of uncharitable cenſures of one another, ſpeaking evil of more than they underſtand, as I have proved in my *Cathol. Theolog.* about this ſubject.

7. Seeing it is above 20 years ſince I wrote that againſt Dr. *Moulin* which you cite, and he never found fault with it, nor juſtified his miſtakes, may I not think that he was convinced and repented? And you that praiſe his death-bed repentance, ſhould not Characterize him by failings twenty years repented of?

8. How do you know that the Dr. repented not of his too hard words of you till his death-bed? You are miſtaken? In his health I more than once blamed him, 1. For his cenſure of Dr. *Stillingfleet* and the other particular perſons, whoſe worth was known, and had deſerved well of the Proteſtant Churches; 2. For his extending thoſe cenſures to the Conformiſts and Church which belong to ſome particular perſons, and the moſt are not guilty of, And 3. For his Book of the *fewneſs* of the *ſaved*, as preſumptuous: And as far as I could then diſcern he repented of them all, but laid the ill Title-page of the laſt on the Book-ſeller: And he ſtill thought of Cauſes and Parties as very different, he owned not his harſh words or cenſures aforeſaid. I found him not *raging* nor *impenitent*.

9. Doth not your own deſcription of his great readineſs to beg forgiveneſs, and lothneſs to own any thing uncharitable, ſhew a better ſpirit than your *picture* doth deſcribe?

10. Is not he as like to be a ſincere man who asketh forgiveneſs of his faults (raſh cenſures and words) as he that repenteth of his former duties, his Pacificatory principles and Writings. Surely to repent of evil is a better ſign than to repent of good.

11. Becauſe you call us to acquit our ſelves by diſowning Dr. *Moulin*, may we not diſown both his faults and our own, without diſowning

ing God's grace and mens piety and worth? would you be ſo diſowned for your own faults? 2. And how ſhould I diſown his raſhneſs better than to write what I wrote againſt him, and ſay what I ſaid to him? would you have a Synod called to reprove every raſh word?

12. Becauſe you juſtly value mens repentance, I will be thankful to you to further mine, and give me leave to further yours. Only I foretell you that your words ſhall not offend me by their hardneſs, if they have but truth, and you call me to repent of my ſin and not of ſerving God. I do not repent of defending Truth and Duty: nor of ſeeking to ſave the Reader from the infection of falſe accuſation and arguings which would deſtroy his charity and innocency, by the fulleſt manifeſting the *falſhood* and *evil* of the words and deeds which are the inſtruments. I take it to be a wrong to thoſe that I would preſerve, to extenuate the danger of the ſnare or poyſon, on pretence of gentleneſs to the Writer. But I deal with the Cauſe and deſire none to hate the perſon: nor would I diminiſh the honour due to him for his parts or vertues; but rather have all men love and magnifie all the good, while they diſlike the evil; and would ſave the Reader at as eaſie a rate to the Writer as I can: But that he ſhould not be related to his falſe or ſinful words or deeds is not in my power to effect. But though I repent not of neceſſary truth, if I any where miſtake, or ſpeak more truth than is profitable, or in language by ſharpneſs more apt to do hurt than good, of this I repent, and ask forgiveneſs of God and man; As I do if I ſpeak ſo ſhort of truth, as with *Eli* to make ſin ſeem ſmaller than it is.

And now I hope you will love your own duty of Repentance better than another mans, and will not be angry if I ſeek to help it.

1. Do you not perceive that while you paint the Dr. as an incredible raging diſtracted lyar, and praiſe his repentance for *raſh words* of others, that you commit the ſame raſhneſs your ſelf againſt him? If you cannot ſee your own face, let any impartial Reader be your glaſs, and ask him whether you do not that which you are condemning?

2. You ſeem to vindicate the Book called the *Friendly Debate*, I ſhall ſhortly further tell you of ſomewhat in it to be repented of. And if partiality made not repentance a very difficult work you would have no need herein of a Monitor. But you may think me partial, though I acknowledg your civilities to me: I can ſhew you a Manuſcript of one both impartial and truly judicious, even the late Judge *Hale*, expreſſing ſo great diſlike of that Debate and the Eccl. Policy, as tend-

ing to the injury of Religion it ſelf, that he wiſheth the Authors would openly profeſs that they write for themſelves, and no more ſo abuſively pretend it is for Religion.

3. You ſay in this Picture that [*If* L. du Moulin *had that honeſt zeal in him to which he pretends, he would have handled Mr.* Baxter *as ſmartly, &c.*

Anſw. There may be other reaſons than want of *honeſt zeal:* But do you not here ſhew that it is the *perſons* more than his *act* that offended you in his reproof? Could you judge it *honeſt zeal* had it been to others? *pag.* 16.

4. You ſay, *p.* 17. He hath ſomething of the Nonconformiſts in him, and for that reaſon he ſpareth him:

Anſw. Do not Nonconformiſts differ from *Eraſtians*? Did not I write againſt his opinion of Church-Government? And did he not beat 22 years ago when Conformity was not in our Controverſies.

5. You ſay of [*the party that come neareſt the doctrine of Calviniſts and Puritans*, (though you ſay you mean ſuch as *D. M.* your Reader muſt ſuppoſe you mean the Nonconformiſts) that [*they are the true Cauſes of all our preſent evils. —For the late War was raiſed, — by the very beſt of you, &c.*] If you mean, as you ſeem, it's ſomewhat extraordinary to perſwade men to believe this in the ſame Land and Age that the War was raiſed in; And for one to do this that had the firſt General of the Horſe in the Earl of *Eſſex* Army, his Patron a few doors from him, and the Lord *Hollis* a Colonel nearer him till lately, and the Lord Preſident of his Majeſties Privy-Council a Colonel not far off him, and many more known Conformiſts, who could all quickly have ſatisfied him how few Nonconformiſts were Members of Parliament or Commanders in the Army when the War began, and that it was betwnen two parties of Conformiſts that the Wars began, as I have proved againſt Mr. *Hinkley*, and can fullier do when there is need. Which party is moſt obliged to repentance you may diſpute with thoſe that are fit for it: But if your intimation be untrue, it is of another nature, and degree than any of Dr. *Moulins*. I confeſs one party did in many Parliaments before, and in that, accuſe Biſhop *Laud* and his new followers, 1. Of Innovations, 2. Of Arminianiſm, 3. Of promoting abſolute arbitrary Government againſt the Subjects Property and Liberty, 4. And of promoting Popery. But if this party were not Conformiſts of the Church of *England*, the Biſhops, Clergy and Gentry were not the Church in Arch-biſhop *Abbots* days before Biſhop *Laud*.

As

As to the Reaſons of their accuſations, and the publiſhing the Articles for Toleration in order to the *Sp.* and *Fr.* Match, &c. I paſs them by. But becauſe you may ſay ſome ſuch think of me as you do of *D. M.* for what I ſay in my *ſearch for the Schiſmaticks*, I only add, 1. That I hope we may tranſcribe mens own words, 2. And may judge that there is ſome difference between the Biſhops that judged the Pope Antichriſt, &c. and thoſe that would have us as the way to unity, to obey him as Patriarch of the *Weſt*, and *principium unitatis*, and the firſt 6 or 8 General Councils, and that ſay our concord muſt be in obeying *unum Collegium Paſtorum*, ruling the whole Church *per literas formatas*, and that ſay the *Roman* Church is a true Church, but ſo are none of the Reformed that have not Biſhops, and a continued ſucceſſive Ordination by ſuch.

A Copy

A Copy of a Letter written by Mr. *Lewis Du Moulin* to the Worthy Dr. *Tho. Coxe*; With the Drs. Anſwer occaſioned by ſome Reports that concetn-ed Dr. *Lewis Du Moulin.*

Worthy Sir,

KNowing the natural inclination you have to oblige all men and the perticular experience I have of your unwearied goodneſs to my perſon and family did incourage me to write both before and now; The occaſion of both was the Reports ſpread abroad of my Father, being informed you had made him the object of your Care during his ſickneſs, I rejoyced that Providence had ordered it ſo that a Perſon of your approved worth and Integrity was concerned about him. I ſhall not trouble you with the Relations Fame has brought into this Country, but ſhall only deſire to know how he died; Was there any advantage taken of his weakneſs of body or mind; How far did his Reported Recantation extend? Reach'd it to any material thing of his Tenets, or only in reference to perſonal Reflections; This is what is humbly deſired by,

Honoured Sir,

Your moſt Humble and obliged Servant,

Lewis Du Moulin.

From my Houſe at *Malton* in *York ſhire*, *October* the 7th. 1680.

The

The Drs. Answer to Mr. *Lewis Du Moulin.*

Sir,

I *Had not delayed to return an Answer to your first Letter, had I known how to direct mine to you, which indeed I had forgotten how to do; This is therefore to let you know that your Father (my honoured Friend)* Dr. Du Moulin, *Dyed as he had Lived, a truly pious man, a great hater of the* Romish *Superstition, and of so much of the* English *Ceremonies as he thought approached those of* Rome; *He loved all good men of what perswasion soever, agreeing in the Fundamentals of the Protestant Religion. When some worthy and Learned men did on his Death bed intimate to him that he had faln too heavy upon many Pious and Learned men of the Church of* England: *He professed himself never to have born any malice in his heart against the Person of any of them, but that his intention was only to blame them for having too much gratified the Enemies of the true Protestant Religion, by their condescentions to them, and their too great compliances with them: He never recanted nor retracted any thing material that he had Professed and Printed of late years; if he had used any sharp expressions, or by any reflections given any offence to any truly pious man, he heartily prayed their pardon, and as heartily forgave all men, as he desired them to forgive him. And this he had often before expressed to me both in publick at my House, and in private between himself and me, and also after that some worthy men had been with him, which gave occasion to this discourse. This for your satisfaction is with truth and sincerity attested by*

Your Affectionate Friend

Tho. Coxe.

London, Octob. 29.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

Five Additional Notices to the Reader.

THere are ſome things of which I thought meet to add this notice to the Reader.

I. That I am more alienated from Conformity in the point of *Aſſent*, *Conſent* and *Uſe*, in denying Chriſtendom to all Children who have no Godfathers and Godmothers, and excluding the Parents from that Office, by ſome late Obſervations which my retiredneſs kept me unacquainted with: I am requeſted by ſome poor People to Baptize their Children: I tell them the Pariſh Miniſters muſt do it. They anſwer me, That they cannot have them Baptized by the Pariſh Miniſters, becauſe they *are poor; and can neither pay the Curate nor the Godfathers:* I ask them, *Cannot you get Godfathers without money:* They ſay, *No: No body will be Godfather to their Children for nothing?* Whereupon enquiring into the caſe, I am informed, that among the poor it is become a trade, to be hired perſons to be Godfathers and Godmothers; and ſome that have not money muſt leave their Children unbaptized, and till lately, Popiſh Prieſts Baptized many. I am not willing to aggravate this *Hiring*, nor the *cauſes* of it, nor that the ſame men that think Baptiſm neceſſary to Salvation, (or as Mr. *Dodwell* ſpeaks, to a *Covenant right to Salvation*) ſhould yet ſhut out all that have not money to hire ſuch Covenanters; But I am not Conformable to ſuch Church-Orders.

II. Whereas there is a great ſtreſs laid on Mr. *Rathband*'s Book of the old Nonconformiſts Doctrine againſt the *Brownifts*, as if they thought that meer obedience to the Law required them to forbear Preaching when they were ſilenced, when indeed they only thought, 1. That it bound them to give up the Temples and Tithes and publick maintenance (which are at the Magiſtrates diſpoſe,) 2. And to forbear that *manner* and thoſe *circumſtances* of their Miniſtry as no Law of God in Nature or Scripture do oblige them to, but will

will do more hurt than good; I have now for fuller satisfaction, here added the Testimony of his Son concerning his judgment and practice: who nineteen years had his liberty in *Lancashire* to Preach publickly, in a Chappel, and after that in *Northumberland*, and no wonder if the disorders of *Brownism* that would have deprived them of all such liberty were opposed. I have perused Mr. *Rathband*'s Book (written by some others) and I find nothing in it that I consent not to, but desire him that would understand it to read the Book it self.

Mr. *Rathband*'s Letter to me is as followeth.

Reverend Sir,

WHereas Doctor Stillingfleet *in a late Book of his hath alledged a Book published by my Father, to prove that Preaching contrary to our Established Laws, is contrary to the Doctrine of all the Nonconformists in former times, I assure you, Sir, that my Father is not to be reckoned in that number; for he exercised his Ministry, though contrary to the Law, for many years at a Chappel in* Lancashire, *and after he was silenced he Preached in private, as he had opportunity and the times would bear; of which I my self was sometime a witness. Afterward, upon the invitation of a Gentleman, he exercised his Ministry at* Belsham *in* Northumberland, *for about a year, and from thence he removed to* Owingham *in the same County, where he Preached also about a year, till being silenced there, he retired into private as formerly. This I thought expedient to signifie to you, and you may make what use of it you please, for what is written here shall be owned by*

SIR, Yours in all Christian respects,

William Rathband.

London, April 2. 1681.

(He is a Grave and worthy Nonconforming ejected Miniſter, living uſually in *High-gate.*) His Father read part of the Common-Prayer, and kept in as aforeſaid.

And I thank Doctor *Stillingfleet* for ſo full a Vindication of ſuch old Nonconformiſts againſt the Accuſations of their Proſecutors.

III. When my Book was almoſt Printed, I received the Manuſcript of a faithful Learned ejected Miniſter, in which, he manifeſteth the fallacy of Doctor *Stillingfleet*'s Allegations of Hiſtory for the Antiquity of Dioceſan Biſhops, and fully proveth that for the firſt three hundred years the Biſhops were Congregational and Parochial, and that with ſo full evidence, as that out of *Strabo* and other Geographers he ſheweth that many of their Seats were but about four Miles from one another, as our Pariſh Churches are; and he confuteth what is ſaid againſt it. And he ſheweth the Doctors groſs abuſe of Hiſtory, to prove that Biſhops needed not the Peoples conſent, and proveth that the Peoples choice or conſent was neceſſary by the conſtant judgment of the Churches.

But this Book is of ſo great worth, that I will not diſhonour it by making it an Appendix to mine, but intend to make ſo bold with the Author, as to publiſh it by it ſelf.

1. As a fuller Confutation to Doctor *Stillingfleet.*

2. As a full Anſwer to Mr. *Dodwell*'s Letters on that ſubject;

And 3. As a Confirmation of my full proof of the ſame things, in my Treatiſe of Epiſcopacy.

IV. And if any will receive that from a Conformiſt, which he will not receive from ſuch a one as I, he may read,

1. Our full and faithful Vindication by a *Beneficed Miniſter*, and a *Regular ſon of the Church*, Called *A Compaſſionate Conſideration of the Caſe of the Nonconformiſts*: I am not ſo happy as to know the Author, but he confirmeth my former Judgment, that a great part of the Paſſive Conformiſts are moderate worthy men, with whom we ſhould earneſtly endeavour as near and faſt a coalition as is poſſible to be had by lawful means.

2. And either the ſame Hand, or ſuch another Conformiſt, hath written Reflections on Doctor *Stillingfleet*, in which the like candor and charity appeareth, though with ſome exceſs of kindneſs to me.

V. With

y. With this Defence against Doctor *Stillingfleet*, I'st shortly publish in another Volume, *An Apology for the Nonconformists Preaching*, with an Answer to a multitude of their Accusers, and Reasons to prove that it is the Bishops and Conformists great *Duty and Interest* to seek their Restoration. Which is the most material part of the Confutation of Doctor *Stillingfleet*, who would perswade us that our Preaching is a sin, and make us guilty of silencing our selves.

FINIS.

3 0C61

Books lately Printed for Nevil Simmons, *at the Three Cocks at the West-end of St. Paul's.*

1. CHurch-History of the Government of Bishops and their Councils abbreviated; including the Chief part of the Government of Christian Princes and Popes, and a true account of the most troubling Controversies and Heresies till the *Reformation*. Written for the use especially of them; 1. Who are ignorant or misinformed of the state of the Ancient Churches. 2. Who cannot read many and great Volumes. 3. Who think that the Universal Church must have one visible Soveraign, Personal or Collective, Pope or General Councils. 4. Who would know whether Patriarchs, Diocesans, and their Councils, have been, or must be the Cure of Heresies and Schisms. 5. Who would know the truth about the great Heresies which have divided the Christian World, especially the *Donatists*, *Novatians*, *Arians*, *Macedonians*, *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, *Monothelites*, &c.

2. A Treatise of Episcopacy; Confuting by Scripture, Reason, and the Churches Testimony, that sort of Diocesan Churches, Prelacy, and Government, which casteth out the Primitive Church Species, Episcopacy, Ministry and Discipline, and confoundeth the Christian World by Corruption, Usurpation, Schism, and Persecution. Meditated in the Year, 1640, when the *Et-cetera* Oath was imposed. Written 1671. and cast by. Published 1680. by the importunity of our Superiours, who demand the Reasons of our Nonconformity.

3. A Moral Prognostication, 1. What shall befall the Church on Earth, till their Concord, by the Restitution of their Primitive purity, simplicity, and Charity. 2. How that Restitution is like to be made, (if ever) and what shall befall them thenceforth unto the End, in that Golden Age of Love. All three by *Rich. Baxter*.

4. *Memorabilia*: or, The most Remarkable Passages and Counsels, Collected out of the several Declarations and Speeches that have been made by the King, his Lord Chancellors and Keepers, and the Speeches of the Honourable House of Commons in Parliament, since his Majesties happy Restauration, *Anno* 1660. till the end of the last Parliament, 1680. Reduced under four Heads; 1. Of the Protestant Religion. 2. Of Popery. 3. Of Liberty and Property, &c. 4. Of Parliaments. By *Edward Cooke*, of the *Middle-Temple*, Esq.

READER,

I Muſt take this opportunity for the avoiding of miſtakes to give thee notice, that whereas againſt them that plead for the neceſſity of an uninterrupted Succeſſion of Epiſcopal ordination, I have in the Preface to my Book for *Univerſal Concord*, and in the beginning of my Breviate of *Church-Hiſtory*, ſaid that our Northern Engliſh Epiſcopacy was derived from ſuch as were no Biſhops, but Scottiſh Monks and Presbyters, and that *Aidan* and *Finan*, (*Trombere*, *Colemun*) were ſuch, leſt I be miſunderſtood, I muſt further explain my meaning; *viz.* 1. The *Culdees* that were no Biſhops, firſt guided the Affairs of Religion in *Scotland*, long before the coming of *Palladius*. 2. Theſe *Culdees* choſe themſelves for order ſake ſome few to be as Guides and Governorus to the reſt, whom Writers called *Scotorum Epiſcopos*, but were no Biſhops in our controverted ſenſe: but as an Abbot among Monks, and as the Preſidents or Principals of Colledges, rule thoſe that are of the ſame office or order with them. Nor had they any limited fixed Dioceſſes.

3. And if any will call theſe Biſhops, and the queſtion

ſtion be but *de nomine*, let them call them ſo and ſpare not: I contend not againſt them.

4. Afterwards *Palladius* ſent from *Rome*, began a higher ſort of Biſhops: But the *Culdees* ſtill kept up the greater part againſt him.

5. *Columbanus* his Monaſtery in the Iſle of *Hy* reſtored the *Culdees* ſtrength. And the Monks out of that Iſland were the moſt prevailing Clergy of *Scotland*; who had no proper Epiſcopal ordination: Or if you will call their ordainers Biſhops, they were not only *ejuſdem ordinis* with the Presbyters, but alſo not ordained by Biſhops themſelves, but made ſuch by miſſion from the Monaſtery, and bare election and ordination of Presbyters.

6. Out of this famous holy Monaſtery, was *Aidan* firſt, and *Finan* after, [and *Trombere* &c.] and *Coleman* after ſent into *Northumberland*, where they are ſaid to be made Biſhops. And they were the firſt Biſhops that came thither; and ſo, had no ordination in *England* from any Biſhops that were there before: Nor is there any probability that the *Palladian* Biſhops did ordain them Biſhops: But that their own order of Senior Monks and Presbyters only ordained them.

7. *Beda* was ſuch a votary to the Church of *Rome*, that his teſtimony runs more for the Romiſh intereſt than moſt of the Scottiſh or Engliſh Hiſtorians of thoſe times: yet *lib.* 3. *c.* 5. ſaith of *Aidan* but that his approbation was in *Conventu Seniorum*, and *ſic illum ordinantes ad prædicandum miſerunt*. And *c.* 25. that Finan *pro illo gradum Epiſcopatus a Scottis ordinatus & miſſus acceperat, qui in inſula Lindisfarnenſi fecit Eccleſiam Epiſcopali ſedi congruam; Quam tamen more Scottorum, non de lapide, ſed de robore ſecto totam compoſuit, &*

a-

arundine texit. Et defuncto Finano, qui post ipsum fuerit, cum Colmannus in Episcopum succederet, & ipse missus a Scotia, &c. And the King *Osiri* himself was taught by the Scots, and was of their Language and for their way. And *Cedda* was ordained by the Scots; And at a Synod three or four of these kind of Bishops with the King and his Son, and *Hilda* a woman, Abbesse, were the Company that made it. c. 25. And c. 26. *Tuda* also was ordained by the Scots. And c. 4. The Bishops themselves were under the Government of the Abbot, *juxta exemplum primi Doctoris, qui non Episcopus, sed Presbyter extitit et Monachus.*

8. *Li.* 3. c. 28. he saith that *non erat tunc ullus excepto* Wini *in tota Britania Canonice ordinatus Episcopus.*

9. And as there is no word of proof that it was the *Palladian Roman* Bishops that ordained these *Northumbrian* Bishops, so there is enough to the contrary, in that all these foresaid Bishops continued the stiffe enemies of the Roman Power and order, which *Palladius* came to introduce. Insomuch that *Beda* oft mentioneth their utter aversion to the Roman party, and that the *Britons* and *Scots*, were all of a mind, and *Dagamus* and the rest would not so much as eate with the Romanists, no nor so much as eat in the same house or Inn with them, *lib.* 2. c. 4.

10. And lastly even that sort of *Episcopacy*, which they took in *Northumberland*, was but Equivocally so called as to that which we dispute about, and not *Ejusdem Speciei.* For. 1. They never pretended to a distinct order from the *Presbyters.* 2. They had but one poor Church made of Wood, and thatcht with Reeds,

Reeds, and no poſſeſſions elſe: And from thence they went from village to village to inſtruct, convert and pray with the people.

And that our Engliſh *Epiſcopacy* derives its ſucceſſion from theſe *Scots* and the *Britains*, and not from *Rome* by *Auguſtine* and *Palladius*, I refer the Reader to Mr. *Jones*, and to the Preface before *Knox* his Church-Hiſtory.

Thus much I thought needfull to prevent being miſunderſtood about the *Epiſcopacy* of *Aidan*, &c. Such an Epiſcopacy as the Biſhop of *Hereford* pleadeth for in his *Naked Truth*, I meet with ſcarce that are againſt; any more than that the Colledge of Phyſicians, or Philoſophers, or Divines have a Preſident.

FINIS.

3 0C61